# NATIONAL ANTI-SLAVERY STANDARD.

Without Concealment---Without Compromise.

VOLUME VIII.---NO. 33. NEW-YORK, THURSDAY, JANUARY 13, 1848. WHOLE NUMBER 397.

PUBLISHED WEEKLY,
BY THE
AMERICAN A. S. SOCIETY,
At 142 Nassau Street, New-York.

SYDNEY HOWARD GAY, Editor.

☞ All communications for the paper, and letters relating to its pecuniary concerns, should be addressed to the Editor.

☞ Donations to the Treasury of the American Anti Slavery Society may be forwarded to FRANCIS JACKSON, Treasurer, at Boston; or to S. H. Gay, Assistant Treasurer, at New-York.

TERMS.—One Dollar per annum: Strictly in advance in all cases.

H. M. HENRY, PRINTER.


## Pro-Slavery.

The following is the report of the Senate Committee in South Carolina, on the subject of the extension of Slavery.

"*Report of the Committee on Federal Relations, on that portion of the Governor's Message relatiae to the Wilmot Proviso, and other resolutions on the same subject.*

"The Committee on Federal Relations, to whom was referred the resolutions of Virginia, accompanying the Governor's message, on the subject of the Wilmot Proviso, and also certain resolutions of the Senate on the same subject, beg leave to report:

"That South Carolina most cordially responds to said resolutions, as embodying the true interpretation of the Constitution of the United States on the subject, and as pointing out the most wise course for this State to pursue. It cannot have been unnoticed by the most casual observer, that within the last few years the abolition party of this country has been increasing in numbers, and growing doubly bold in their flagitious attempts to foment a spirit of insubordination among our slaves, and to destroy the value of this species of property. To consummate such purposes, that party has left no means unresorted to. Against the slave owner they have excited every bad passion, and seized upon every occasion to vilify and misrepresent him. Regardless of our laws, they have deluded and enticed away our slaves, and when detected in the theft, and convicted by the judgment of their own courts, they have trampled on the law, and put its executive officers at defiance. Availing themselves of the Press, they have prostituted its liberal licenses, and have lighted it into firebrands, which they have hurled into our midst, to inflame the minds of the deluded victims of their instruction to the business of insurrection and midnight butchery.

"The slave owner has been pictured as a monster, exceeding in atrocious practices all others in cruelty and barbarity, and, from the alleged enormity of his life, he has been denied Christian fellowship, and even his departing soul has been pursued at death, and, by a sold assumption of Divine intelligence, denied even a hope of Heaven. The press, the public assembly, the Legislatures, and the pulpit itself, have all participated in such denunciation.

"It has been in vain that the defenders of Slavery have showed that the system has existed in every age of the world—that it was established in the Old, and sanctioned in the New Testament. In vain have they brought to view that the system was forced upon them by Great Britain, and that the Northern and Eastern States were among the first and most benefited traffickers in human flesh. In vain have they demonstrated that the system as now practiced has meliorated the condition of the slave, and that no plan ever suggested or attempted for his manumission has proved other than a heavier bondage—all such evidence has been disregarded, and the fanatic and the bigot have warmed into a maddened zeal, which threatens nothing short of a violation of our rights or destruction to the Union. Nor have the difficulties which thus surround the subject been of recent origin. As far back as the adoption of the Constitution of the United States, the question of Slavery was one of imminent difficulty, and which produced the most angry feelings among the framers of that instrument. Fortunately, however, for the Union, though perhaps not so fortunately for ourselves, a compromise was effected, and while the existing institution of Slavery was to be observed, full guarantees for its future protection were promised. Among other causes for our protection, these were insisted upon—that to each State should be guarantied a republican form of Government, [Art. iv. § 4;] that every citizen was to be protected in life, liberty, and property, [Amend. v.;] and while Congress was to have power to dispose of, and make all needful rules and regulations respecting territory or other property belonging to the United States, nothing contrary to the Constitution was to be so constructed as to prejudice the claims of the United States or any particular State, [Art. iv, § 3.]

"With these solemn guarantees to the property and rights of the slaveholding States, it was to be hoped that no mad spirit would disinter the question of Slavery, and again drag it forth to madden and distract the land. Much, however, as such an occurrence was to be deprecated, it has nevertheless presented itself, and, under the guilty profanation of liberty, parties have grown up, and, infusing their spirits into the Legislatures of several States, have induced them to declare, 'that the existence of Slavery is a great calamity—an immense social and political evil; that it ought to be abolished as soon as that end can be properly and constitutionally attained; and that in view of this they will strenuously resist the annexation of any new territory to this Union, in which the institution of Slavery is to be tolerated or established.'

"Such, then, is in substance the legislative resolve of at least ten of the sovereign States of our Union—most, if not all of them, from time to time, have transmitted their resolves, as notices to the Executive of our State; and heretofore these insults upon her character, and aggressions on her rights, have been repelled by a return of the resolutions to the States whence they emanated.

"Your Committee will not dwell upon the progressive steps by which the abolition party has arrived at its present position of strength, nor will they discuss whether that strength is intrinsic, or borrowed from the temporary position of other parties. It is enough to know that this party has its Representatives in the Congress of the United States, session after session, insulting us with their vile denunciations, and defaming with their falsehoods; that they have disregarded compromises we have made them, and, in two instances during the past session, have refused to observe any of the features of that compromise; and, as if gaining boldness by their outrages, they have, during the same session, trampled down our constitutional guarantees, and have, in the popular branch of Congress, declared, 'to prohibit the extension of Slavery in all territory to be hereafter acquired by the United States.'—Against these gross encroachments on our constitutional rights, it is matter for congratulation that South Carolina is not likely to become the only protestant. Conscious that usurpation of right grows more reckless when submitted to, and that silence under wrong becomes ignominious, the slave States have at length been aroused, and, with Virginia in the lead, are speaking out with an emphasis that will not be mistaken. Your Committee, therefore, in the language of our Executive, earnestly recommend for adoption the following resolutions of the Legislature of Virginia, as a correct exposition of our rights, and as pointing out the proper principles of action, together with a resolution expressive of the opinion of this Legislature as to the course to be pursued in the event of the passage of those resolutions by Congress."

---

Frederick Douglass, the nigger pet of the British Abolitionists, has fixed upon Rochester, as the place in which to establish an abolition paper, for which the funds have been furnished in England, for the express and impudently avowed object of destroying the Constitution and Union of the United States.—We heard this saucy nigger in the Broadway Tabernacle, boast of his hatred to this Government and its institutions, and boast of the encouragement he received on the other side of the Atlantic. Detroit and Cleveland have been spoken of as the place selected by this British emmissary for the scene of his operations: but we have now before us the prospectus of the "North Star," to be published in Rochester.

We do not know what the worthy citizens of Rochester will do in this case—or whether they will not think it beneath them to do anything. Douglass, considered apart from his white backers, on both sides of the Atlantic, is of little importance—a smart, unprincipled mulatto. Still the establishment and apparent support of his paper there will be a serious detriment to the place; and as a moderate sum of money would, doubtless, induce Douglass to go to Toronto, or Kingston, in Canada, where he will be much more at home, the Rochester people will do well to buy him off.—*Sunday Dispatch.*

## Selections.

### THE AMISTED CASE.

Mr. Giddings made an ineffectual effort on Tuesday to refer to a Special Committee so much of the President's Message as relates to the Amistad Negroes. In supporting this motion he gave a history of this important case. We copy a portion of his speech from the *National Intelligencer:*

When the general appropriation bill was under consideration in the Senate at the last session, an amendment was attached to it giving fifty thousand dollars as a compensation for these slaves to the claimants. This amendment came down here; and, after hearing the exposé of his venerable friend who sat before him, (Mr. ADAMS,) of some fifteen minutes, there were only twenty-three persons willing to vote for it in Committee, and in the House only forty.—It was hurled unceremoniously from that body, and stamped with the express disapprobation of the House; and, having lain over only from that time—the close of the last session—they were recommended by the President to make this appropriation, to tax their constituents, to pay over this money to these dealers in human flesh.

The object of his motion was not to send this subject to the Committee on Foreign Affairs; and on naming a Select Committee, he said he had no desire or wish to be placed upon that Committee.—But it was his desire that the venerable gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. ADAMS), who had stood in the relation of counsel to this case from its commencement, should be placed upon it; and then he should like to see placed upon it some of the ablest statesmen and lawyers on the other side of the case; so that both sides of the question might be fully presented, and that we should not hereafter have the records of the country falsified.

It was his object, therefore, to send this subject to a Select Committee, that a report might be drawn up and sent to the people, that they might be thoroughly informed in relation to it. He did not know but that it was his duty to speak more at length on this matter; but he would only say that the President had urged them—to do what? To sustain the Spanish slave-trade. He asks us to tax the people, to take that which they earn by the sweat of their brows, to pay men engaged in the slave-trade for the failure of their speculations. This was a subject not agitated by him; it was urged upon them by the President, and it had been again and again urged upon them by the Committee on Foreign Affairs.—He wished to disabuse the minds of any who thought he had agitated this question. He would take this occasion to say that he had never agitated the question of Slavery here but to redeem the North from all participation in it—from all unconstitutional participation in it. He held in his hand a resolution which had been passed by the Legislature of South Carolina, and he rejoiced that he had one occasion to speak with approbation of the action of South Carolina on the subject of Slavery.

The honourable gentleman here read the resolutions to which he referred, which were understood to deny any right to the free States to interfere with Slavery in the South, and also to Congress under the Constitution to exercise any control over it. These, he said, were sentiments which were concurred in by the North. For himself he responded most heartily to the resolutions. They had no power to cause the abolition of Slavery in the South, nor had Congress the right to require the North to give the institution of Slavery any support. He desired emphatically to repeat that they had here no power whatever in connection with the institution of Slavery. This position was so clearly sustained by the Constitution that he who runs may read. The doctrine, then, of the South Carolina resolutions was true. We have no right to interfere with it. We never had any right to interfere with it. Every movement heretofore by which this House has taken the jurisdiction was a violation of the Constitution. And yet the President now asked them to interfere with that around which the Constitution had thrown a barrier. He asked them to do that which the people had no right to meddle with, to establish, uphold, or put it down, and he hoped this House would refuse to gratify the President in this particular.—Would the Representatives of the North make such a concession? Would the Whig party yield their assent to such dogmas of the President? If the Chairman of the Committee of the District of Columbia were present he would ask him if there was any probability of their repealing the laws of Congress by which they had exercised jurisdiction over this subject in this District? He directed attention to the slave-pen in view of this Capital, in which there was more sighing, and weeping, and groaning, and more human suffering than imagination could paint. From all connection with such cruelties he wished the people that he represented to be absolved. He hoped, therefore, that Congress would refuse to entertain the subject, and not, as invited by the President, tax the people to perpetuate and encourage the infliction of pain and misery. He desired to wash his hands of it.

He called the attention of the House to the effect of such interference. It was to encourage the slave-trade on the coast of Africa: it was to involve us in the crime of piracy. This interference with Slavery had involved us in a war, in which now so much American blood was being poured out, and the treasures of the nation were squandered with an extravagance heretofore unknown to this nation. Were, then, the gentlemen of the North prepared to respond to the call of the President to sustain the Spanish slave trade? Their action on this important subject at this session of Congress would make an interesting chapter in the biography of many American statesmen. He called upon Representatives of the people from every section of the Union to come forward and meet this question without excitement. The position which he had laid down, and which he should now sustain, was that this House had no right to interfere with the subject. They had no right to sustain it in any State of this Union. They had no right to impose on any free State the duty of meddling with it. He hoped, then, that this position would be sustained, for to do otherwise would involve a violation of the Constitution. They of the North had neither the power nor the constitutional right to interfere with it. If that institution were a blessing, let the South take all its blessedness to themselves. If it were a curse, let the North be saved from its malign influences. That the North might be redeemed from that curse, he called upon the Northern Representatives to come forward and say to Slavery, "Thus far shalt thou go and no farther."

As to the right of the negroes of the Amistad to do what they did, he had no doubt. They were kidnapped from Africa, and had a right to defend themselves by all the laws of God and man; they had the right, also, to rise on their captors and hurl them into the deep to achieve their own liberty, just as would the citizens of the North if they should be seized and carried to the Havanas for a like purpose. The position of the parties (the Spaniards and negroes) was one of war; but when the negroes came on our shores they were entitled to all the rights of hospitality from our people. We had no right to interfere between them and their captors. They were freemen and they had the rights of freemen.—But we took them from their ship and gave it to the Spanish claimants. This was wrong. If we were now called to give the negroes the value of the ship he would vote for it. But he would only add, that he desired to send the case to a Select Committee in order that we may have full reports on both sides of the question.

### SLAVE TRADE IN VIRGINIA.

"I was told by ——— ———, of Richmond, that a slaveholder in Petersburg had assured him that last year the number of slaves sent southward from that place averaged nine hundred per week. An intelligent keeper of a public house in Petersburg thought the estimate was rather under than over the truth. Some of these slaves are brought by railroad from the northern parts of North Carolina, and with those collected in other parts of the country, sent by sea to our southern ports. The railroad southward from Petersburg is also used to forward many '*droves*' on their way to South Carolina, Alabama, &c. Georgia does not allow slavetraders to bring their ware, but the law is evaded by the coffle being kept over the Carolina line, where the planters come and purchase, and can legally remove their own slaves.—Some traders own or rent plantations in Georgia, and settling upon them for a time with their gangs, sell out there. The conductor of the Raleigh cars told me he took a great many slaves both ways. There were some 'packed,' as I heard the speculator call it, in the baggage car, when we went South. The day before when ——— ——— went on, there were upwards of fifty. A great many were seen by Friends coming up to the Yearly Meeting at New Garden. One told me he had seen three hundred. ——— ——— thought the slave-trade of Richmond as great as that of Petersburg. From 1830 to 1840, the trade not only kept down the increase, but lessened the numbes of slaves in Virginia, twenty thousand. [It has been stated on good authority that in the year 1834, one hundred and twenty thousand slaves were carried from Virginia.] It was told by an intelligent slaveholder in Richmond, with evident pleasure, of the numbers sent away, and that the State was fast becoming free. I replied that as *Virginians* they might rejoice, but I did not see how they could as *philanthropists*, as the slaves were not liberated, but, on the contrary, rendered far more miserable, and the evil was extended into new States. I conversed with a number of slaveholders, and found the place of bad usage always '*further South*'—in their opinion. A planter from Louisiana drew for me a beautiful picture of a happy peasantry—the blacks on the sugar estates!!"—*Cor. of Non-Slaveholder.*

GREEK AND SLAVERY.—A copy of the New Testament has been found in Mississippi, in the Greek language and characters, which is said to favour abolitionism, and there has, consequently, been raised a terrible storm, as, of course there ought to be. Now if that single copy should, by any accidont fall into the hands of some daring slave, would he not appeal at once to the fanaticism of his brethren in bonds, who may be members of church, and feel ready to dare and do aught that Scripture might sanction? It seems to us now, that we see a "field hand" sitting, on a holyday, near the quarters, and "*tuptoeing*" away to his fellow slaves, the clipping, shuffling utterance to the Southern blacks, employed upon sonorous beauties of Helenic diction. We have not a single Greek type in our office, or we would give a portion of the good book in the good language, and then invite our readers to conceive the treasonous group assembled, and the leader pouring out his Greek to them, stirring them up in the very words of the Great Apostle, or amusing them in the language which Demosthenes used. Somebody says that the text is modern Greek. That does not lessen its importance; it only changes the sable reader from a Demosthenes to a Colocotroni. Dangerous times when Greek Testaments are scattered among the slave population of the South.—*U. S. Gazette.*

### GEN. CASS'S LETTER.

We alluded to this extraordinary letter yesterday; we say extraordinary, for such it really is. The more we examine it, the more absurd it appears in point of argument. The letter declares that if a treaty of peace between the United States and Mexico should contain a clause in favour of the preservation of freedom in such territory as we would acquire, that it would be rejected by the Senate—rejected because the citizens of the slaveholding States would be deprived of a participation in the benefits of the cession. They could not take their slaves there and hold them. Gen. Cass assures us that Slavery cannot exist in any part of California or New Mexico; yet in the face of this natural exclusion, he says that the Senate would reject a treaty that merely declared that Slavery should not be planted where it could not exist.

The annexation of Texas is evidence that there is more than one mode by which we can acquire territory. Mexico may not make a treaty with us, and circumstances may arise which would justify us in bringing a portion of the Mexican territory into the Union by a majority vote in both houses of Congress.

We think the letter of Gen. Cass an unfortunate one, and one that can do him no good. If he is an aspirant for the Presidency, this letter will weaken his position. The change of sentiment which he asserts has taken place in his mind, will be attributed to a desire to get Southern support. A citizen of his own State remarked to us yesterday that the course of Gen. Cass would lose him Michigan, should he be a candidate. You cannot eradicate from the minds of the intelligent portion of the people the belief that the change of opinion expressed by Gen. Cass is produced by other causes than a conviction of former error. Even the South will so consider it, and their good opinion of Gen. Cass will not be enhanced. Distinguished as is the name of Senator Cass, his reputation for consistency must be impaired by this letter. We have before us his great speech, in which he approves of the free territory principle; then we have a string of reasons for his vote against the free territory clause, making a part of the Three Million Bill—not denying the correctness of the principle, but arguing that the time for its adoption had not yet arrived; and now we find him declaring that this same principle is unconstitutional. This letter will never make Gen. Cass President.—*N. Y. Globe.*

### SPEECH OF JOHN C. CALHOUN.

On the 4th instant, the following resolutions offered by Mr. Calhoun, came up for consideration in the United States Senate:

Resolved, That to conquer Mexico and to hold it, either as a province, or to incorporate it in the Union, would be inconsistent with the avowed object for which the war has been prosecuted; a departure from the settled policy of the Government; in conflict with its character and genius; and, in the end, subversive of our free and popular institutions.

Resolved, That no line of policy in the farther prosecution of the war should be adopted which may lead to consequences so disastrous.

We should be glad to copy the whole of Mr. Calhoun's speech, did our limits permit; we make, however, very full extracts, enough to give the gist of the whole of it, from the excellent report in the Tribune:

Mr. Calhoun said: In offering to the Senate these resolutions for your consideration, I have been governed by the reason which induced me to oppose the war, and by the same considerations I have been ever since guided. In alluding to my opposition to the war, I do not intend to notice the reasons which governed me on that occasion, farther than it is necessary to explain my motives upon the present.—I opposed the war then, not only because I considered it unnecessary, and that it might have been easily avoided; not only because I thought the President had no authority to order a portion of the territory in dispute, and in possession of the Mexicans, to be occupied by our troops; not only because I believed the allegations upon which it was sanctioned by Congress, were unfounded in truth, but from high considerations of reason and policy, because I believed it would lead to great and serious evils to the country, and greatly endanger its free institutions.

But after the war was declared, and had received the sanction of the Government, I acquiesced in what I could not prevent, and which it was impossible for me to arrest; and I then felt it to be my duty to limit my course so as to give such direction to the conduct of the war as would, as far as possible, prevent the evil and danger with which, in my opinion, it threatened the country and its institutions. For this purpose, at the last session, I suggested to the Senate a defensive line, and for that purpose I now offer these resolutions. This, and this only, is the motive which governs me. I am moved by no personal or party considerations. My object is neither to sustain the Executive, nor to strengthen the opposition; but simply to discharge an important duty to the country. But I shall express my opinion on all points with boldness and independence, such as becomes a Senator who has nothing to ask, either from the Government or from the people; and whose only aim is to diminish, to the smallest possible amount, the evils incident to this war. But, Mr. President, when I come to notice these points in which I differ from the President, I shall do it with all the decorum which is due to the Chief Magistrate of the Union.

* * * * * * *

We have, for all our vast expenditure of money, for all the loss of blood and men, we have nothing, but the military glory which the campaign has furnished.

We cannot, I presume, estimate the expenses of the campaign at less than forty millions of dollars; (I cannot compute the sum with any degree of precision, but I believe I may say about that sum,) and between the sword and disease, many thousands of lives, probably five, six, or seven thousand, have been sacrificed; and all this for nothing at all.

But it is said that the occupancy of a defensive line would have been as expensive as the campaign itself. The President has assigned many reasons for that opinion, and the Secretary of War has done the same. I have examined these reasons with care.—This is not the proper occasion to discuss them; but I may say, with all possible deference, they are to my mind utterly fallacious. I will put the question in a general point of view, and satisfy the minds of Senators that such is the case.

The line proposed by myself, extending from the Pacific ocean to the Paso del Norte, would have been covered by the Gulf of California, and wilderness peopled by hostile tribes of Indians; and for its defence nothing would have been needed beyond a few vessels of war and a single regiment. From the Paso del Norte to its mouth, we can readily estimate the amount of force necessary for its defence. It was a frontier between Texas and Mexico, when Texas had not more than one hundred and fifty thousand of a population—without any standing army whatever, and very few troops. Yet for seven years Texas maintained that frontier line; and that, too, when Mexico was far more consolidated than she is now, when her revolutions were not so frequent, her resources in money much greater, and Texas her only opponent. Can any man believe that Mexico, exhausted as she now is—prostrated as she has been—defeated—can any man believe that it will cost as much to defend the frontier as the last campaign has cost? No, Sir. I will hazard nothing in asserting that the very interest of the money spent in the last campaign would have secured that line for an indefinite period, and that the men who have lost their lives would have been more than sufficient to defend it.

So much for the past; we now come to the commencement of another campaign; and the question is, what shall be done? The same measures are proposed. It is still "a vigorous prosecution of the war." The measures are identically the same. It is not for the conquest—that is now as emphatically disavowed as it was in the first instance. The object is not to blot Mexico out of the list of nations; for the President is as emphatic in the expression of his desire to maintain the nationality of Mexico as ever. He desires to see her an independent and flourishing community, and assigns strong and cogent reasons for all that. Well, Sir, the question is now, what ought to be done? We are now coming to the pratical question. Shall we aim at carrying on another vigorous campaign under present circumstances?

Mr. President, I have examined this question with care, and I repeat, that I cannot support the recommendations of the President. There are many and powerful reasons, stronger than those which existed at the commencement of the last campaign, to justify my opposition now. The cost in money will be vastly greater. There is a bill for ten additional regiments now before the Senate, and another bill providing for twenty regiments of volunteers has been reported making in all not less, I suppose, than twenty-five thousand troops, raising the number of troops in the service—as, I presume, the Chairman of the Committee on Military Affairs can inform you—to not much less than seventy thousand in the whole. Well, Sir, the expense will be much more than that of the last campaign. It will cost not much short of sixty millions of dollars.

Now, Sir, what is the condition of the money market at present? Last year it was flourishing. An unfortunate famine in Europe created a great demand for our agricultural products. The balance of trade was in our favour. If money poured out at one end of the sub-treasury it poured in at the other. But how stands the case now? We stand now with a drain both ways. The exchanges are in our favour, and therefore, instead of gold and silver, drafts founded on exports will be remitted. The exchanges in Mexico must be met either by remittances in gold and silver, or by drafts drawn in favour of British merchants, or other capitalists there, which must be cashed here and also transmitted abroad.—Now, Sir, what will be the operation of this state of things? How long can this continue? What is the present price of treasury notes and of stocks in the market? Are they above par? No, Sir.—I see them quoted below par. I understand the treasury notes are sensibly below par and stocks still lower. Now what is to be the result? So long as treasury notes are below par, so long as they are the chief medium, the end of it will be, that treasury notes will go into the treasury and specie come out of it. There is very great danger that at last your treasury will be drained to the bottom.

Now, Sir, in this state of things, what can possibly follow? A great commercial crisis—a great financial crisis—even possibly, a suspension of the banks. I do not pretend to deal in the language of panic. But there is danger of all this, of which there was not the slightest apprehension at the commencement of last session. At present, there is great danger. The great difficulty in prosecuting your campaign will be to obtain money. Men you may raise, but money it will be difficult to get. I lately conversed with a gentleman who ought to know these things better than myself, and he supposed that forty millions of dollars would be required, either in the shape of treasury notes or stocks, to carry on the campaign. I asked at what price money could be had; and the reply was, that it would be at the rate of ninety for one hundred, which would be rather more than seven per cent. I believe.

But, Sir, these are not the only objections, formidable as they are. The farther you proceed the difficulties will increase. I do not see the slightest chance that can tend to the realization of what it is avowed the prosecution of the war is intended to accomplish. The object is to obtain a treaty. We no longer hear of conquering a peace, but of obtaining an honourable treaty; the meaning of which is neither more nor less than that we are to obtain a treaty from Mexico's giving us acession of land equal to the whole indemnity already stated in the former part of my remarks. Well, Sir, as it strikes me, whether the war is successful or unsuccessful, it must certainly end in the defeat of the object, for the attainment of which it is avowedly prosecuted. If the war be unsuccessful, I need not argue the point. If we should be baffled in our arms—as I trust we will not be, and I think it not very likely to be the case—but if circumstances should prove unfortunate for us, and we should not be able to accomplish, in a military point of view, what is characterized as a vigorous prosecution of the war, then certainly there will be no treaty. I take higher ground. I insist upon it that the more successfully this war is prosecuted, the more certain will be the defeat of the object designed to be accomplished, while he objects disavowed will be accomplished.

How is a successful war, to be carried on? What is the object of it? What is it intended to effect? I can see but one thing to be effected. It is to suppress all resistance in Mexico, to overpower and disperse her army, to overthrow her civil Government, and to leave her without any farther power of resistance. Well, Mr. President, if that be done, what is the result? How are you to get an honourable peace? It takes but one party to make war—two parties to make peace. If all authority in Mexico be overthrown, if there be no legitimate power with whom to negotiate, how are you to accomplish those objects which it is proclaimed this vigorous prosecution of the war is intended to effect?

I must confess I am a little at a loss to see how a free and independent Republic can grow up under the protection and authority of its conqueror. I do not see how such a Government can be established under his authority. I can readily understand how an aristocracy—how a kingly Government—a despotism, might be established by a conqueror. But how a free and independent Republic can grow up under such circumstances, is to me incomprehensible. I had always supposed that Republican Government was the spontaneous work of the people—that it came from the people—from the hearts of the people;—that it was supported by the hearts of the people, and that it required no support—no protection from any quarter whatever. But, Sir, it seems that these are antiquated notions—obsolete ideas—and that we may now manufacture Republics to order, by authority of a conquering Government.

But suppose, Sir, all these difficulties surmounted. How can you make a free Government in Mexico? Where are your materials? It is to be, I presume, a confederated Government like our own. Where is the intelligence in Mexico adequate to the construction of such a Government? That is what she has been aiming at for twenty odd years, but so utterly incompetent are her people for the work, that it has been a complete failure from beginning to end. The great body of the intelligence and wealth of Mexico is concentered in the priesthood, who are altogether disinclined to that form of Government. Then the owners of the haciendas—the large planters of the country, who comprise almost all the remaining mass of intelligence, are without opportunities of concert and destitute of the means of forming such a Government. Sir, such a Government would be impossible—and if put up, would tumble down the very next day after our protection was withdrawn.

* * * * * * *

The President talks, Sir, of taking indemnity into our hands, then; but, why not take indemnity now? We are much nearer indemnity now than we will be at the end of the next campaign, when we shall have sixty millions added to the expenditure of the last forty. What will you then have to indemnify you? Nothing but a Mexican population, on whom you are to impose taxation in all forms and shapes, and among which you will have to maintain an army of at least forty thousand men; according to the Senator from Mississippi, (Mr. DAVIS,) not a very large number, for he says that the thirty-three thousand men now there are in danger. That is no indemnity at all. You will never get enough in that way to meet your expenditures. It will all have to come out of the pockets of the people of the United States; and after all the talk of indemnity, of pushing on this war vigorously to success, at the end of the next campaign, instead of indemnity, you will have a heavy pecuniary burden imposed upon the present and succeeding generations.

Well, Mr. President, we have now come to the solemn question proposed by these resolutions. I have shown where this line of policy will, in all probability, lead you—I may say, will inevitably lead you, unless some unexpected contingency should prevent. It will lead to the blotting out of the nationality of Mexico, and the throwing of eight or nine millions of people without a Government on your hands. It will compel you, in all probability, to assume the Government; for, I think, there will be very little prospect of your retiring. You must either hold the country as a province, or incorporate it into your Union. Shall we do either? That's the question. Far from us be such an act, and for the reasons contained in the resolutions.

The first of these reasons is this: it would be inconsistent with the avowed object for which the war has been prosecuted. That needs no argument after what has been said. Since the commencement of the war till this moment, every man has disavowed the intention of conquest—of extinguishing the existence of Mexico as a people. It has been continually proclaimed that the only object was indemnity. And yet, Sir, as events are moving on, what we disavow may be accomplished, and what we have avowed may be defeated. Sir, this result will be a dark and lasting imputation on either the sincerity or the intelligence of this country: on its sincerity, because so opposite to your own avowals; on your intelligence, for the want of a clear foresight in so plain a case as not to discern the consequences.

* * * * * * *

The next reason which my resolutions assign is, that it is without example or precedent, either to hold Mexico as a province, or to incorporate her into our Union. No example of such a line of policy can be found. We have conquered many of the neighbouring tribes of Indians, but we never thought of holding them in subjection—never of incorporating them into our Union. They have either been left as an independent people among us, or been driven into the forests. I know farther, Sir, that we have never dreamed of incorporating into our Union any but the Caucasian race—the free white race. To incorporate Mexico would be the very first instance of the kind of incorporating an Indian race—for more than half of the Mexicans are Indians—and the other is composed chiefly of mixed tribes.

I protest against such a union as that! Ours, Sir, is the Government of the white man. The greatest misfortunes of Spanish America are to be traced to the fatal error of placing these coloured races on an equality with the white race. That error destroyed the social arrangement which formed the basis of society. The Portuguese and ourselves have escaped—the Portuguese at least, to some extent, and we are the only people on this continent which have made revolutions without being followed by anarchy. And yet it is professed and talked about to erect these Mexicans into a Territorial Government, and place them on an equality with the people of the United States. I protest utterly against such a project.

Sir, it is a remarkable fact, that in the whole history of Man, as far as my knowledge extends, there is no instance whatever of any civilized coloured races being found equal to the establishment of free popular Government, although by far the largest portion of the human family is composed of these races. And even in the savage state we scarcely find them anywhere with such Government, except it be our noble savages—for noble I will call them. They for the most part had free institutions, but they are easily sustained among a savage people. Are we to overlook this fact? Are we to associate with ourselves as equals, companions, and fellow-citizens, the Indians and mixed race of Mexico? Sir, I should consider such a thing as fatal to our institutions.

The next two reasons which I assigned, were, that it would be in conflict with the genius and character of our institutions and subversive of our free Government. I take these two together as they are intimately connected; and now of the first—to hold Mexico in subjection.

Mr. President, there are some propositions too clear for argument; and before such a body as the Senate, I should consider it a loss of time to undertake to prove that to hold Mexico as a subjected province, would be hostile and in conflict with our free popular institutions, and in the end subversive of them.

Sir, he who knows the American Constitution well, he who has duly studied its character; he who has looked at history, and knows what has been the effect of conquests of free States invariably, will require no proof at my hands to show that it would be entirely hostile to the institutions of the country, to hold Mexico as a province. There is not an example on record of any free State even having attempted the conquest of any territory approaching the extent of Mexico without disastrous consequences. The nations conquered have in time conquered the conquerors by destroying their liberty. That will be our case, Sir. The conquest of Mexico would add so vast an amount to the patronage of this Government, that it would absorb the whole power of the States in the Union. This Union would become imperial, and the States mere subordinate corporations.

* * * * * * *

I come now to the proposition of incorporating her into our Union. Well, as far as law is concerned, that is easy. You can establish a territorial Government for every State in Mexico, and there are some twenty of them. You can appoint governors, judges, and magistrates, you can give them subordinate Government, allowing them to legislate for themselves, while you defray the cost. So far as law goes the thing is done. There is no analogy between this and our territorial Governments. Our territories are only an offset of our own people, or foreigners from the same regions from which we came. They are small in number. They are incapable of forming a Government. It would be inconvenient for them to sustain a Government if it were formed; and they are very much obliged to the United States for undertaking the trouble, knowing that on the attainment of their majority—when they come to manhood—at twenty-one—they will be introduced to an equality with all the other members of the Union.

It is entirely different with Mexico. You have no need of armies to keep your territories in subjection. But when you incorporate Mexico, you must have powerful armies to keep them in subjection. You may call it annexation, but it is a forced annexation, which is a contradiction in terms, according to my conception. You will be involved, in one word, in all the evils which I attribute to holding Mexico as a province. In fact, it will be but a provincial Government, under the name of territorial Government. How long will that last? How long will it be before Mexico will be capable of incorporation into our Union? Why, if we judge from the examples before us, it will be a very long time. Ireland has been held in subjection by England for seven or eight hundred years, and yet still remains hostile, although her people are of a kindred race with the conquerors.

A few French Canadians on this Continent yet maintain the attitude of a hostile people, and never will the time come in my opinion, Mr. President, that these Mexicans will be heartily reconciled to your authority.—They have Castilian blood in their veins—the old Gothic quite equal to the Anglo Saxon in many respects—in some respects superior. Of all nations of the earth, they are the most pertinacious—have the highest sense of nationality—hold out the longest, with the least prospect of effecting their object. On this subject also I have conversed with officers of the army and they all entertain the same opinion that these people are now hostile, and will continue so.

But, Mr. President, suppose all these difficulties removed. Suppose these people attached to our Union, and desirous of incorporating with us, ought we to bring them in? Are they fit to be connected with us? Are they fit for self-government, and for governing you? Are you, any of you, willing that your States should be governed by these twenty odd Mexican States, with a population of about only one million of your blood, and two or three millions of mixed blood, better informed, all the rest pure Indians, a mixed blood, equally ignorant and unfit for liberty, impure races, not as good as the Cherokees or Choctaws.

We make a great mistake, Sir, when we suppose that all people are capable of self-government. We are anxious to force free Government on all; and I see that it has been urged in a very respectable quarter, that it is the mission of this country to spread civil and religious liberty over all the world, and especially over this continent. It is a great mistake. None but people advanced to a very high state of moral and intellectual improvement are capable, in a civilized state, of maintaining free Government; and among those who are so purified, very few, indeed, have had the good fortune of forming a Constitution capable of endurance. It is a remarkable fact in the history of Man, that scarcely ever have free popular institutions been formed, by wisdom alone, that have endured.

* * * * * * *

We think we may now indulge in everything with impunity, as if we held our charter of liberty by "right divine"—from heaven itself. Under these impressions we plunge into war; we contract heavy debts; we increase the patronage of the Executive, and we even talk of a crusade to force institutions of liberty upon all people. There is no species of extravagance which our people imagine will endanger their liberty in any degree. But it is a great and fatal mistake—the day of retribution will come. It will come as certainly as I am now addressing the Senate, and when it does come, awful will be the reckoning, heavy the responsibility somewhere!

* * * * * * *

After saying that I cannot support the course recommended by the Executive—I will proceed to state that which I would propose as the best to be pursued. Well, then, I will say that there is not the smallest chance of our disentangling ourselves from this Mexican concern which threatens us so much—there has not been in my opinion, the smallest chance, from the commencement of the war until this time, but by taking a defensive line, doing that now which the President recommended should be done finally after the conquest, and taking indemnity into our own hands. To do this depends on our own volition, and not on the fleeting consent of Mexico. Sir, if time had been allowed to the Senate, when the Message of the President, recommending war, was before them, if time had been allowed to the Senate, I would have announced the course of policy which I thought right, but time was not permitted.

My opinion was that we should have simply voted Taylor the means of defending himself. That ought to have been done. There, then, should have been a solemn report from the proper Committee, going into all the circumstances, showing that the Republic of Mexico had not yet recognized these hostilities—recommending a provisional army to be directed to a proper point, giving time to the Mexican Congress and Mexican people to have considered whether they would avow or disavow the attacks upon us; and if no satisfaction were obtained, not to make war in this set form, but seize upon the portions of the country contiguous and most convenient to us, and then have assumed the defensive line. These are my views; but unfortunately, we were all acting here under an urgency, without time to reflect. We were pushed on, and told, if you do not act to-day, nothing can be done.

Well now, Sir, as to where the defensive line should be at the present time, I do not presume to offer an opinion. I suggested a line at the last session. I am not prepared to say what would be the proper one at the present time, but I do say that we must vacate the central parts of Mexico. We must fall back, if you choose to use that word, or take a line that shall cover ample teritory for indemnity.

For my part, I am not for charging Mexico with the whole expense of the war; but I would take ample territory, and hold it subject to negotiation. Now, Sir, I know it will be said, that this will be as expensive as the war. I think I have said enough to show that that cannot be, that it will fall far short of it; but I will not repeat the argument. But admitting that it should; admitting that, by no means concludes the argument; for the sacrifice of men, would be infinitely less, and what is more important, you will thereby be enabled to disentangle yourselves. This is the only way by which it can be done. You are tied at present, as it were, to a corpse. My object is to get rid of it as soon as possible.

* * *

I look not to Mexico; I look to our own country and her institutions. I look to the liberty of this country and nothing else. Mr. President, if we but preserve our liberty, by a proper course of moderation, acting justly toward our neighbour, and wisely in regard to ourselves—if we remain quiet, resting in idle and masterly inactivity, and let our destinies work out their own results, we shall do more for liberty, not only for ourselves, but for the example of mankind, than can be done by a thousand victories.

* * * * * * *

Now let me say that in asserting that a defensive line was the only alternative to the plan recommended by the President, I have put out of the question the course which most of you advocate—taking no indemnity of territory; because, I believe that the voice of the country has decided irrevocably against it; and that to keep it as the alternative would but render more certain the adoption of the policy recommended by the Executive, and in consequence the conquest of the whole country. Let me say farther, to my friends on the other side of the Chamber, for I regard them as such (it is our good fortune to differ in politics here, without permitting our personal feelings to be affected)—that they have contributed by

their course to give the public that strong and fixed determination not to terminate the war without some suitable indemnity. I do not allude to your voting on the bill recognizing the existence of war between the Republic of Mexico and the United States. No one knows better than myself, that you voted for the bill with the view of furnishing immediate relief to Gen. Taylor and his army—and not in reference to the war—that you even protested and remonstrated against that interpretation being put upon your vote. But after the bill passed, and the war was authorized, most of you continued to vote appropriations to prosecute the war with the object expressed of acquiring territory as an indemnity. Now, I must say I cannot see how the two can be reconciled—how your vote to acquire territory can be justified, and at the same time your opposition to the acquisition of territory as means of indemnity, when it is acknowledged on all sides, that that is the only means by which it can be acquired.

* * * * * *

Now, I have delivered my opinion with that candour and frankness which I hope become my position on this floor. I shall now propose nothing, but if I find that I can be supported in these, my views, I will undertake to raise a committee to deliberate, after consulting with those officers who are now fortunately in this city, upon the best defensive line that can be taken. If it should be fortunately adopted, we may not get peace immediately. The war may continue for some years, but we will accomplish that all-important consideration—the extrication of ourselves and the country from this entanglement with Mexico.

### THE TEN REGIMENT BILL.

SPEECH OF HON. JOHN P. HALE.

UNITED STATES SENATE, January 6, 1848.

The Bill to raise, for a limited time, an additional military force, was read a third time.

The question being on the passage of the bill,

Mr. Hale, of New Hamshire said: Feeling compelled, from my convictions of duty, to take a course in reference to this bill, in which, I am aware, very few Senators will entirely coincide, I have thought, humble as is the sphere in which I move, that it was due to those who placed me in the position I occupy, to let my vote upon the bill go out accompanied with the reasons which have induced me to take the course which I am about to take. I would have been glad, if older and abler Senators had favoured the Senate with their views in opposition to this bill. I would have been glad, if the action of the Senate upon the bill had been delayed until the documents coming from the several Departments, and which we were well nigh getting, had been placed before us, so that we might have had all the light that could be thrown upon that, which in my mind, is a dark subject at the lightest; but seeing that the bill is likely to go through the forms of legislation, and become a law without having those lights before us, I have thought it necessary to trespass briefly upon the time of the Senate, in order to express the views which I entertain. It may be said that I do not stand much in need of light, because I have already declared that I stand here ready to vote against the war in all its forms; against any measures for the supply of troops, either regulars or volunteers, (and if there are any other kinds, I go against them,) because I stand prepared to vote against the appropriation of a single dollar beyond the simple amount—as I have before suggested—which will be sufficient to bring home your troops by the shortest and cheapest route. Entertaining these views, before entering upon the discussion of the bill, I want to say a word in regard to a sentiment which I have heard avowed here, and elsewhere, and it is—that when the country is engaged in war, we lose all discretion, we have nothing to do but grant the supplies that are demanded of us—an appeal being made to our patriotism, patriotism only can find rightful action in a support of the war—that there is no patriotism anywhere else, and that the administration which has been so fortunate or unfortunate as to plunge the country into a war, has only to appeal to the country, and expect to receive no other response except hearty and unanimous support And this doctrine has been carried so far, and in such high places, that the President of the United States has denounced as treason, the opposition of Congress, although his mode of prosecuting the war did not accord with their convictions. I recollect but one incident in my reading of history which is analagous. It is stated by an English historian that when Queen Elizabeth had summoned her Parliament, and they were about to organize for business, she sent her messenger to them with this royal mandate; she told them to be very careful that they did not meddle with affairs of State, "because," said she, "such things are altogether beyond the compass of your narrow understanding." Well, our royal President did not follow exactly in the footsteps of Elizabeth. He did not question the understanding of Congress, but their patriotism. Now, let us see where this doctrine will carry us. Let us see to what it will lead. Suppose you should have an exceedingly bad and corrupt administration—mind I do not not say that this is such an Administration, or that we are ever likely to have such a one. But suppose that such a thing were possible, and that the measures of the President had become exceedingly odious, oppressive, burdensome, and intolerable, and that notes of disapprobation were beginning to be heard from the people assembled in their primary meetings; that the tones of indignation at last penetrate the walls of the palace, and the President, finding that he could not stand against the united will of an injured people, what has he to do? Ought he to desist in his course of wrong-doing, or to retrace his steps? No, Sir, this is not the path to popularity; according to his new school of ethics and morals, he has only to go on and plunge the country into war, and, if he can manage so skilfully, as to involve the country in two wars at once, so much the better—so much the more glory for him, a popularity greater than that of Washington or a Jackson. This is the inference, the plain and unmistakable inference. War, instead of being, as it is said to be by all writers on ethics or politics, the direst calamity which Heaven in its wrath can send upon a nation, is converted by this alchemy into a healing Bethesda, in which political profligacy and corruption of the darkest hue may wash itself and be clean. Sir, I utterly deny the soundness of this doctrine, that Congress ought to have no voice beyond granting the supplies. If there ever is a time when opposition should be vigilant, scrupulous, watchful, noticing everything that is wrong, it is at a time when, through the acts of the Administration, the country is burdened with an unnecessary war; when the fruits of industry are consumed for the support of such war, and when we are surrounded by all the horrors which war brings in its train. If there ever is a time that should put men upon their individual judgment, reflection, and responsibility, it is such a time; and such is our position now, and we are there by the unadvised, unconstitutional, and illegal acts of the President. I propose, I say, to do what I may, feeble as it may be, to place the country right. I have never learned in that school of moral or political science that by persevering in an unconstitutional and wrong course, we shall ever come out right.

And, Sir, there is another view which is sometimes taken, which certainly does not accord with my own convictions, and upon which I wish to say a word or two at this time, (and I do it with deference to the opinions of abler men about me,) and which relates to the course which those should take who believe the war to be wrong, radically wrong. Why, I think I have heard an idea something like this: The country is engaged in a war which is unjustifiable—we confess it is wrong to go on, we see clearly it is wrong—nevertheless, we are now at war, and the President calls on us for supplies of men and money, and Senators say they will vote men and money, but by some sort of a process which escapes my comprehension, they imagine they are going to throw the responsibility on the President. I confess I do not understand how they are to escape their due share of responsibility, they must share the responsibility with the President, let the character of the act be what it may. If the war be wrong, put an end to it at once. I have no doubt the President will be exceedingly gratified with opposition of this kind. You will hear nothing about a factious opposition in the organ of the Administration.—The President would care little for the opposition of the whole world, if it were opposition of this kind. It is very like Sam Weller, who happened to find himself in prison, and a person he met was bewailing the misfortune of having a thousand pound left to him by will, which circumstance was the occasion of his imprisonment. "I wish," exclaimed Sam, "all my enemies would try to ruin me in that way." Just so with the President. You tell him he is wrong, while at the same time you vote him all the men and money that he asks you for.

Believing that the cause of this war is radically wrong, I hold it to be the first, the plainest, and the simplest duty of those who think as I do, to withhold supplies, and compel the President to do what we suppose to be right. Believing there is a strict and pertinent analogy between the course to be pursued by Congress, and that which is taken by the British Parliament, I consider that the course of those who think the war wrong, is plain and clear, and admits of no mistake. Upon a question of voting supplies, I think the very first thing to be inquired into by Congress, is, whether the object for which the supplies are demanded is a correct and legitimate object. If it be determined that the object is a proper one, let the supplies be granted—if otherwise, withhold them. This is my understanding of the nature of our Constitution. I have heard our Government spoken of as a Government of checks and balances, but when you speak of the President having the power to make war unconstitutionally and illegally, I cannot understand the cause or propriety of that course of conduct which would sustain him in his unconstitutional act.

Believing, then, that the question of this war is a question which ought to be discussed; that it lies at the very bottom of the question of supplies, I will proceed to give my views to the Senate and the country, of this war. And, as I suggested the other day, in the few remarks which I had the honour to submit, I believe that the cause of the war lies a little deeper than any that has been assigned by those who have expressed their opinions upon the subject. I believe that the question, whether it arose from the march of Gen. Taylor to the Rio Grande, or whether any of these identical or temporary movements were the immediate cause of the war, is entirely irrelevant. The cause, Sir, lies deeper than any of these; and when I speak of the cause of the war, permit me to say, that I do it with no desire to introduce exciting or angry discussion, or to arouse unpleasant feeling; but having a duty to perform here, I must do it fearlessly—I must do my duty as an American Senator, feeble as it may be.—And when we speak of the cause of this war, I must avow my conviction, beyond a cavil or a doubt, to be, that it lies in the avowed policy of the American Government—a policy which was avowed four years ago—to make the extension of human slavery one of its primary motives of action. And when I say this, let me be understood. I refer to the principle avowed in the diplomatic correspondence which preceded the annexation of Texas to the United States. And permit me to say, that in approaching this question, I do it with a desire and a disposition to do full justice to the officers of this Government who were engaged in this correspondence. I will do them the justice to say, that what they did, they did manfully and aboveboard. There was no concealment. They came out boldly. Their course was very different from that of a set of men we have among us, called Northern men with Southern principles—men who profess to be against Slavery, but who are nevertheless enlisted in the slaveholding interest, ready to do Slavery's bidding. That was not the case with the men to whom I have referred. They came out boldly and avowed the object at which they aimed, and the means by which they proposed to attain it. Let this be ever said to their credit.

In that correspondence the objects of this Government are as evident, as much beyond controversy, as anything can possibly be. No, Sir! If the fingers of a hand were sent from the throne of Eternal light, to write this upon the wall over your head, it would not flash conviction more readily to the mind than is done by a perusal of that correspondence. I will not go through the whole of it, but will content myself with sending to the clerk and asking him to read an extract from this letter.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, August 8, 1843.

SIR: A private letter from a citizen in Maryland, then in London, contains the following passage:

"I learn, from a source entitled to the fullest confidence, that there is now here a Mr. Andrews, deputed by the Abolitionists of Texas to negotiate with the British Government; that he has seen Lord Aberdeen, and submitted his *project* for the abolition of Slavery in Texas; which is, that there shall be organized a company in England who shall advance a sum sufficient to pay for the slaves now in Texas, and receive in payment Texas lands; that the sum thus advanced shall be paid over as an indemnity for the abolition of Slavery; and I am authorized by the Texan Minister to say to you, that Lord Aberdeen has agreed that the British Government will guarantee the payment of the interest on this loan, upon condition that the Texan Government will abolish Slavery."

This proposition, it will be seen, was exceedingly simple and easy to be understood. It announced, not that there was a scheme on foot among a set of fanatical politicians, to decoy away the slaves, not to steal them—nothing of that sort—but a proposition had been entertained, by which the Government and slaveholders of Texas agreed to abolish Slavery, and for this agreement on their part, it was said that a company had agreed to advance a stipulated price. What right had our Government to interfere? The Secretary says "a movement of this sort cannot be contemplated in silence." I agree it should not; but what should every American heart have said, when it was found that a scheme of this kind was on foot. Should they not have burst out in thankful aspirations to Almighty God, that such a scheme of benevolence as that had even been thought of. I think the Secretary says well in saying that they could not look on in silence.

The Secretary farther says, "Such an attempt upon any neighbouring country would necessarily be viewed by this Government with very deep concern."

Certainly, they should have looked on with deep concern, as deep as that with which affection watches by the side of dying love, now gathering hope from the symptoms, that the smiles of health will again smooth the cheeks of love, and then trembling lest the pall of despair should settle on our hopes.

Again, he says, "It cannot be permitted to succeed without the most strenuous efforts on our part to arrest a calamity so serious to every part of our country; so serious to New Hampshire, to Massachusetts, and the other New England States. And, Sir, this bill which is now before you, is one of the measures which are to be adopted to redeem the pledge thus made. In the same letter it is said:

"The establishment, in the very midst of our slaveholding States, of an independent Government, forbidding the existence of Slavery, and by a people born, for the most part, among us, reared up in our habits, and speaking our language, could not fail to produce the most unhappy effects upon both parties."

When I saw it formally announced by the Government that it could not produce any but "unhappy effects," I thought that I was mistaken in the reading. I thought it must be a mistake of the printer, but I found that it was no mistake, that the announcement was really made. What a mistake, then, did the Pilgrim Fathers make in coming to found a colony in the New World, where they might avoid the consequences of Slavery. Had they not Slavery enough at home, that they bade farewell to everything that bound their hearts to the land of their birth,—the land where the bones of their fathers reposed—and came over and founded the institution of American Slavery? Was it for this that the May-Flower sailed from the coast where Slavery prevailed? Was it for this that those patriots wandered from England to Holland, and from Holland here? In Heaven's name, was not England oppressive enough? One more extract and I leave the letter:

"Few calamities could befal this country more to be deplored than the establishment of a predominant British influence and the abolition of domestic Slavery in Texas."

Few calamities could befal the country like this!

I had understood, up to the time when I read this declaration, that the institution of Slavery, for good or bad, was a State institution. I thought it was one which the General Government had no right to touch. Everything that I had ever heard upon the subject had tended to take that institution from the cognizance of the General Government, and make it exclusively a subject of State policy. But here I find it baptized, and made one of the gods, before which the whole people are to bow down and worship.

From this cause, whether remote or immediate, this war proceeded. Can any man deny this? We may have our doubts whether, if there had been more caution and prudence, this war would have been precipitated upon us at so early a period. But is it not evident that the whole matter springs from this? Was not Annexation itself an act of war! War was existing between Mexico and Texas at the time. By the very fact of annexing to ourselves one of the belligerent nations, we incurred the responsibility of fighting her battles. If this, then, be the cause of the war, I come next to the question, how this war commenced? Well, Sir, it may seem exceedingly strange that one should be found asking that question at this time, when the President has told us over and over again so many times how it commenced—that it commenced by the act of Mexico. Said the President in his Message to Congress of the 11th May, 1846:

"In my Message at the commencement of the present session, I informed you that, upon the earnest appeal both of the Congress and Convention of Texas, I had ordered an efficient military force to take a position 'between the Nueces and the Del Norte.' This had become necessary, to meet a threatened invasion of Texas by the Mexican forces, for which, extensive military preparations had been made. The invasion was threatened solely because Texas had determined, in accordance with a solemn resolution of the Congress of the United States, to annex herself to our Union; and, under these circumstances, it was plainly our duty to extend our protection over her citizens and soil.

"This force was concentrated at Corpus Christi, and remained there until after I had received such information from Mexico as rendered it probable, if not certain, that the Mexican Government would refuse to receive our Envoy.

"Meantime, Texas, by the final action of our Congress, had become an integral part of our Union. The Congress of Texas, by its act of December 19th, 1836, had declared the Rio del Norte to be the boundary of that Republic. Its jurisdiction had been extended and exercised beyond the Nueces. The country between that river and the Del Norte had been represented in the Congress and in the Convention of Texas; had thus taken part in the Annexation itself; and is now included within one of our Congressional districts. Our own Congress had, moreover, with great unanimity, by the act approved December 31, 1845, recognized the country beyond the Nueces as a part of our territory, by including it within our own revenue system; and a revenue officer, to reside within that district, has been appointed, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate. It became, therefore, of urgent necessity to provide for the defence of that portion of our country. Accordingly, on the 13th of January last, instructions were issued to the General in command of these troops to occupy the left bank of the Del Norte."

And in his annual Message to Congress on the 8th of December, 1846, he repeats the assertion, and he not only repeats the declaration that war exists by the acts of Mexico, but he says every honourable effort has been made by him to prevent the war, but all proved in vain, and the war has come, notwithstanding he was so exceedingly opposed to it. Now I desire to examine this matter. The President is not satisfied with thus telling us that the war arose from the act of Mexico, and that he had used every honourable exertion to avoid it. He comes forward in his Message this year, and tells us fourteen times distinctly, and several times impliedly, that it arose from the act of Mexico. It seems a part of the President's religion to accompany his more solemn acts with the continual declaration, that "war exists by the act of Mexico," as it was of the followers of Mohammed to preface their more serious sayings with the oft-repeated avowal, that there was "no God but Allah, and Mohammed is his Prophet." Now let us examine this matter: did it commence by the act of Mexico? Such is not my reading. The taking possession of Texas was of itself an act of war. Sir, at the time of the American Revolution, when France signed a Treaty of Alliance with us, Great Britain was not long in finding out that that was an act of war. But suppose that act was not one of war, what follows?

One of the fundamental conditions of the Joint Resolution for annexing Texas to the United States, was war.

"First, said State to be formed subject to the adjustment by this Government, of all questions of boundary."

"Subject to the adjustment of all questions of boundary." That was the very first condition which the American Congress fixed to the act of Annexation. Well, is it necessary for me to stand here to-day to tell the American people, that if there is a question of boundary existing, and one party goes and occupies the territory to the extreme verge of the claim—that is an act of war? Why, I think the President himself, in the course of the controversy with Great Britain, must have found that this was the case, although one of the first acts of his Administration was to tell the people in his Inaugural Address, that our title to Oregon was clear and unquestionable. I saw the President amid the dripping of the storm, standing at the east front of this Capitol, reminding the people how young a man he was, and yet he would have the whole of Oregon. I almost expected to hear him say—

"You'd scarce expect one of my age,
To speak in public on the stage."

I know not whether I was more amused at the juvenility of the President, or his determination to seize upon the whole of Oregon. He would not even submit the question to arbitration, because that would be admitting that Great Britain had some sort of title there. Nothing short of the whole would satisfy him. Why, a man could hardly be recognized as a Democrat in the Eastern States, unless he was for claiming the whole of Oregon. He must go for 54 40, or he was no Democrat; and one State Legislature was so violent in the cause, that they were for claiming 54 49. I wonder it never occurred to the President to send our troops and take possession of the territory up to that line. Why did he not do this? Because he knew, and everybody knew, it would be an act of war. He knew it would be so considered by Great Britain, and resented by her. Well, so it was here. The sending of Gen. Taylor to the Rio Grande was, beyond all controversy, an act of war. But I propose to give you the President's own account of it. In his Message of May, 1846, he says:

He kept the troops at Corpus Christi until it was rendered certain that the Mexican Government had refused to receive Mr. Slidell. Well, on the 10th day of November this commission was appointed, and not being much acquainted with matters of diplomacy, I of course take what the President said as being what he meant.

"MR. SLIDELL'S LETTER OF CREDENCE.

JAMES K. POLK,
*President of the United States of America.*

"GREAT AND GOOD FRIEND:—I have made choice of John Slidell, one of our distinguished citizens, to reside near the Government of the Mexican Republic, in the quality of Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary of the United States of America. He is well informed of the relative interests of the two countries, and of our sincere desire to restore, cultivate, and strengthen friendship and good correspondence between us; and, from a knowledge of his fidelity and good conduct, I have entire confidence that he will render himself acceptable to the Mexican Government, by his constant endeavours to advance the interest and happiness of both nations. I therefore request your Excellency to receive him favourably, and to give full credence to whatever he shall say on the part of the United States. And I pray God to have you in his safe and holy keeping.

"Written at the city of Washington, the tenth day of November, in the year of our Lord one thousand eight hundred and forty-five, and of the Independence of the United States the seventieth. Your good friend,

By the President, JAMES K. POLK.
James Buchanan, Secretary of State,
To his Excellency, Don Jose Joaquim Herrera.
President of the Mexican Republic."

"And pray God to have you in his holy care and keeping." How pious the President is! He prays for his enemies. This was written on the 10th of November.—Now I want to read another document, to show how Mr. Polk was treating his good friend on the 15th of June, preceding. In a confidential communication from the War Department, dated June 15, to Gen. Taylor, I find the following:

"The point of your ultimate destination is the western frontier of Texas, where you will select and occupy, on or near the Rio Grande del Norte, such a site as will consist with the health of the troops, and will be best adapted to repel invasion, and to protect what, in the event of Annexation, will be our western border. You will limit yourself to the defence of the territory of Texas, unless Mexico should declare war against the United States.

"Your movement to the Gulf of Mexico, and your preparations to embark for the western frontier of Texas, are to be made without any delay."

Well, now, what do you think of this pious President? On the 15th of June, he ordered the troops to be ready to embark for the coast of Mexico, and five months afterward, he sends a messenger to Gen. Herrera, and by the hands of this messenger, a supplication to Almighty God, "to have him in his safe and holy keeping," lest this prayer should fail, he had taken the precaution to send Gen. Taylor with his army, five months before, to take him in his care and keeping. Well, I will not detain the Senate long on this part of the matter. It seems to me it is too plain for cavil; and if I had the issue to be tried before twelve good men and true, the first witness I would call would be James K. Polk—for I never knew a witness who was conscious of telling the truth, who found it necessary to repeat so often the same assertion. Why does the President go into so long and laboured an effort to prove that we had good cause of war? If this were the case, and we had not commenced it, instead of being to our credit, it would have been a disgrace to us. It would have shown us a pusillanimous nation. It is therefore, a *felo de se* of his argument. Because, if this were the case, it shows that we should have done what the President has laboured to show we have not done. The President may conquer Mexico, but he can never succeed in conquering the truth. He may direct as many guns to bear upon it as it would require to silence a Mexican battery, but he will not be so successful.

Well, if this was the cause of the war—if this was the manner in which the war commenced, what are we carrying it on for now? What do we propose? What do we want? Why, in the Message of the President to Congress in 1846, he tells us that it was not conquest that he desired; but in the Message of this year he modifies it a little. Now the conquest he disavows; that is, he does not mean to take the whole of Mexico. I suppose that he means to divide it very much as Lord Aberdeen divided Oregon with him, to take what he wants and leave the rest. He says:

"It was never contemplated by me to make a permanent conquest of Mexico, or to destroy her nationality."

Well, Sir, actions speak louder than words, and I need not admonish gentlemen on this floor of this fact, for I have proof in my hand. What does the President tell you? I heard it asserted by a Senator the other day, that Senators voted for the appropriation of the war under a protest. That they did it for nothing else than to relieve Gen. Taylor from the critical position in which he was placed. The President came and made the thrilling announcement that American blood had been shed on American soil. And while every heart palpitated at such an outrage, Senators, anxious to relieve Gen. Taylor, were now willing to vote the supplies required, even though the bill for raising them was accompanied by the declaration which, at that time, they believed to be untrue, that "war existed by the act of Mexico." They gave their votes under the protest that it was expressly for the relief of Gen. Taylor. And what does the President now say to those Senators? Why, he says you did not mean any such thing. You could not have meant it. You knew that indemnity must be acquired. Senators, when you passed that vote, you all meant to get territory. The President has said so. He is your Executive officer—surely he ought to know; and the President has a right to say it, because actions speak louder than words. You voted him the men and the money; you gave him the sword and the purse, and you gave him unlimited license to conduct the war as he pleased, and now you must pass this bill—give him the ten regiments of regulars, and afterwards twenty regiments of volunteers, and let him thus, according to the Senator from Kentucky, increase his available forces in Mexico to ninety thousand, and go on, subjugating that country; and what will he tell you at the next session? He now tells you:

"Congress could not have meant—when, in May, 1846, they appropriated ten millions of dollars, and authorized the President to employ the military and naval forces of the United States, and to accept the services of fifty thousand volunteers, to enable him to prosecute the war; and when at their last session, and after our army had invaded Mexico, they made additional appropriations, and authorized the raising of additional troops for the same purpose—that no indemnity was to be obtained from Mexico at the conclusion of the war, and yet it was certain that if no Mexican territory was acquired no indemnity could be obtained.

"It is farther manifest that Congress contemplated territorial indemnity, from the fact, that at their last session an act was passed, upon the Executive recommendation, appropriating three millions of dollars with that express object. This appropriation was made 'to enable the President to conclude a treaty of peace, limits and boundaries with the republic of Mexico, to be used by him in the event that said treaty, when signed by the authorized agents of the two Governments, and duly ratified by Mexico, shall call for the expenditure of the same, or any part thereof.' The object of asking this appropriation was distinctly stated in the several Messages on the subject which I communicated to Congress."

Vote him now the men and money he now asks, and what will he tell you at the next session? What, that Congress intended to overrun all Mexico! He will say, you meant that I should carry destruction throughout the whole of that country—that

"I should dip my sword in blood, and write my name
On desolated lands and cities."

And he would have a right to say so! Vote him the men and the money he wants—let him have ninety thousand troops there, and he will enact scenes that perhaps we little think of; and at the next session he will come and tell us that was what he meant, and he will have a right to do so, because actions speak louder than words. We certainly, in giving our votes, must be supposed to have some object to attain—that object the President can construe for himself.

In regard to the amendment which has been proposed to this bill, instead of making it better, it leaves it more obnoxious still. It leaves it to the President's discretion whether to embody these troops or not; but that is the very thing we ought not to do. He has had discretion enough. Was it not at his discretion that our troops were marched to the Rio Grande? It seems to me that the true course is to take the discretion into our own hands, and make specific appropriations for specific objects. Then we shall know for what objects they are made.

But the President says now, he does not want the conquest of the whole of Mexico, but he wants indemnity and security. Well these are words easily pronounced. But we had a good old lesson in New England, requiring the definition of words to be given. Indemnity for what? Security for what? I find the indemnity he wanted, was not only indemnity for our claims, and for all the expenses of the war; but in addition to all this, he wanted to drive a bargain with them—he was not willing to make peace unless they would sell him a part of their country with its inhabitants, for I read in the 5th and 6th articles of the treaty proposed by our Government to Mexico, as follows, viz:—

"ART. 5. In consideration of the extension of the limits of the United States, as they are defined by the preceding article, and by the stipulations which are farther contained in Article 8, the United States abandon forever against the United Mexican States all reclamation on account of the costs of this war; and, beside, agree to pay to the United Mexican States, in the city of Mexico, the sum of———,

"ART. 6. In full consideration of the stipulations contained in Articles 4 and 8 of this treaty, the United States agree to assume and pay all sums at present due to claimants, and those which may be hereafter established, according to the Convention concluded between the two Republics, in the city of Mexico, on the 20th of January, 1843, to provide for the payment of what shall be decided in favour of the claimants, according to a Convention between the United States and the Mexican Republic, on the 11th of April, 1839. And the United States equally agree to assume and pay all reclamations of citizens of the United States against the Government of the United Mexican States, not previously decided to an amount not exceeding three millions of dollars which have arisen prior to the 13th of May, 1846, and which shall be adjudged to be due by a commission established by the Government of the United States, whose decisions shall be definitive and conclusive: *Provided, always*, That in deciding on the validity of the said demands, the commission shall be guided and governed by the principles and rules prescribed by the first and fifth articles of the unratified Convention, concluded in the city of Mexico on the 20th of November 1843, and in no case shall they give judgment in favour of any claim not embraced by these principles and rules. And the United States, for the present and the future, exonerate the United Mexican States from any of the said demands whatsoever, which may be admitted or rejected by said board of commissioners."

He requires payment of our unliquidated claims—he requires the expenses of the war, and in addition to these he requires that they shall sell him just as much territory as he sees fit to buy at his own price—this is the indemnity and security he wants. Are Senators prepared to sanction these views? Can they face the indignation of the world, after having insisted on them? Here is a Government enfeebled—broken down: a people distracted—having a natural attachment to the homes of their birth—to the soil beneath which moulder the bones of their fathers; and because they do not choose to sell their country and themselves, the President says the war must be prosecuted and carried into the vital parts of Mexico.—Well, now, the course of the President seems to me decidedly reprehensible. Perhaps I have commented upon it in a manner not quite becoming to this place—I hope not.

I cannot help remarking in justice to him, that he has not shown a disposition for war in all cases. I think in the management of the Oregon treaty he exhibited a Christian meekness to a surprising degree. But he did not inherit the blessing of the meek. He did not get the land. He would not submit to arbitration. Well, how did he settle it?

Let Mr. Packenham, the British Minister, tell his own story:

"WASHINGTON, June 13, 1846.

"MY LORD: In conformity with what I had the honour to state in my dispatch (No. 68) of the 7th instant, the President sent a Message on Wednesday last to the Senate, submitting for the opinion of that body, the draft of a Convention for the settlement of the Oregon question, which I was instructed by your Lordship's dispatch (No. 19) of the 18th of May, to propose for the acceptance of the United States.

"After a few hours deliberation on each of the three days, (Wednesday, Thursday, and Friday,) the Senate by a majority of 38 votes to 12, adopted yesterday evening a resolution advising the President to accept the terms proposed by her Majesty's Government. The President did not hesitate to act on this advice, and Mr. Buchanan accordingly sent for me this morning, and informed me that the conditions ordered by her Majesty's Government were accepted by the Government of the United States without the addition or alteration of a single word.

"I have the honour to be, &c.
R. PACKENHAM

"The Right Hon. the Earl of Aberdeen."

He takes it just exactly as it was cooked up for him, very much as sick children are directed to do when they have an unpalatable dose of medicine to take—"shut your eyes and open your mouth and down with it." Now I have not a word to say against the settlement of the Oregon question, but it seems to me that it would have read a little better in history if it had not been preceded by so much blustering and bragging. And it was a little amusing to see the effect it had on our Eastern Democracy. The man who did not go for 54 40 was a Federalist, a traitor: and some were so zealous that they even got up to 54 49. Upon them the treaty came like a thunderclap, and they had to reverse the steam so suddenly that it came nigh producing a fatal collapse in the party.

But, Sir, the President is not so entirely warlike in his nature as his conduct to Mexico would indicate; he has other and milder qualities; he nearly has none of that ferocious spirit, characterized by the poet as—

"That stern joy which warriors feel
In foeman worthy of their steel."

It is a colder country at 54 40. Now, if right in the position I have taken here, the question is, what is the duty of the American Senate? What are they to do?—To go and vote these ten regiments? The honourable Senator from Kentucky the other day said he did not know why regulars were preferred to volunteers. I do not know that I do. But Yankees guess sometimes.

War is to be made, Sir, not only upon Mexico, but on the free labourers of the country, and the first onslaught is to be made in the shape of a tax on tea and coffee; and it is the patronage which the creation of these ten regiments is to give him, which he thinks will enable him to effect it, and the President has probably come to the conclusion taught by the experience of the past, that with the patronage of ten regiments at his command, "*some things may be done as well as others.*"

I think the Senator from Kentucky, with his great acumen, if he looks through his glasses, may discover why the President prefers regulars.

Well, why cannot Senators who think with me, that the war is wrong, radically wrong, come out and declare so by their votes? Why sit here denouncing the President, and then be guilty of the inconsistency—with all deference I say it—of voting men and money to carry on the war? Why, it is said it would be unpopular to withhold the supplies. Are we afraid to trust the people with a great question of right? Sir, I think those who are afraid to trust the people, underrate them. Are men afraid to do that which is right because it may not be popular? Sir, it is this ghost of the unpopularity of opposition to the war, which seems to sit like a nightmare upon American Statesmen. Sir, I think there was more truth than poetry in what was said by a Western man. He said he got caught by opposing the last war, and he did not mean to get caught again—he intended now to go for the war, pestilence, and famine. And I think there is a good deal of that feeling in the country now. Men are afraid to take a bold stand.

It is said the people have already decided this matter, that they have settled that the war shall be prosecuted. I deny it entirely. I do not believe it. People have settled it! I have never met among the people, one in ten, who thought the war was right, or thought that it would be right farther to prosecute it.

I believe, Sir, that the heart of this whole people is sick of the miserable, temporizing policy, which is putting justice, and right, and truth out, in order that expediency may walk in and govern, control, and direct our actions. I wish that the experiment might be tried by Congress, of acting and voting on this matter according to the convictions of their own understanding as expressed by themselves, when they speak of the character of this war. I listened, the other day, with great pleasure, to the remarks of the honourable Senator from South Carolina. I trust I heard with profit the suggestions which he threw out when speaking on his resolutions. But, I confess that I was somewhat astonished that a man of his great experience—his vast learning—his keen observations—could really think that there could be any virtue in the passage of these resolutions. I would like, indeed, to see those resolutions passed, not that I think that their passage would do any good in the world in the present emergency. But they might, if adopted, serve as a sort of a landmark, showing with what rapidity and what proclivity we have traveled the road to ruin. But that there would be any virtue in them I have not the least idea. Pass these resolutions unanimously, in both branches of Congress, and let the President append to them his usual declaration that the war was commenced by Mexico; nay, you may go beyond that, and with all the forms and solemnities with which you could embody them, you may make them part of the written fundamental Constitution of the land, and what would they be worth? Not the paper upon which they are written; for the very moment that they stood in the way of a popular majority, they would be utterly set at naught. He that is not persuaded of that, has not read, it seems to me, the first primer of our history. I think that the resolutions themselves contain much that is just and true, and that the passage of them might be of some consequence in the way I have suggested. But that their passage would check the downward tendency of affairs, is altogether out of the question.

I believe that the people desire us to go right, and that we have not faith enough in the people. Nothing is more common than to find aspirants for public favour, flattering the people and continually praising their patriotism, and every thing which gives value and dignity to the human character. But you do not find those eulogists of the public virtue at all prepared to venture a little upon the intelligence which they vaunt so much.—There is faith in expediency, in policy, in everything but justice, truth, and right.

The present is, I believe, a critical period in our history, I believe, that it is presumptuous in us to affirm, as the President has affirmed in his Message, that the great question of the capability of man for self-government has been settled. It is not settled, Sir. We are now settling it. Whether the manner in which we are settling will favourably or unfavourably affect the condition of mankind hereafter, yet remains to be seen in the future.—We are settling the question not only for ourselves, but for all who are to come after us. If here the experiment of self-government should fail, who can estimate the consequences to our race? We are to day writing our history. We are impressing that little space we occupy between the past and future, with footsteps which will be indelible. Whither are those footsteps tending? Shall those who are to succeed us, find that the course which we are now pursuing, lead to the broad fields of liberty, of peace, of prosperity. Or shall it be, that we are only erecting monuments marking the paths that lead to the pitfalls of destruction? These are questions that must come home to the heart of every man who loves his country, and prizes its free institutions, and sees the danger which now threaten them. Are we so blind, so fanatical, so stupid as to believe that the great laws of the physical and moral world are to be reversed in our favour? Are we emphatically the children of destiny? Can we take our destiny in our own hands and control it? Not so. It seems to me that there is a light streaming down the pathway of ages, illuminating the destiny of nations, and that it is written in glaring characters—retribution. It is a law in operation all around us—in the physical, moral and political world. It is as true of nations as of individuals: "Whatsoever a man sows, that shall he also reap." I would ask those disposed to look at this question in the light of history, to go back and by its aid trace the long vista of ages that have elapsed. Let them go back, if they will to the morning of creation, when all the sons of God shouted together for joy, that Almighty Power had spoken a new world into being; and they will not find it recorded in any page of that history, that any nation ever sowed the seeds of war and slavery, and reaped the fruits of peace and liberty.—No! that passage remains to be written; and it requires no very great effort of the imagination to fancy that we can hear the voice of all nations of the past sounding a solemn warning in our ears. Let us beware lest that fate which has constantly followed such a course of policy may not soon be ours.

I have endeavoured to discharge my duty. I am quite aware of the imperfection of the effort. But before I conclude, I wish to say a single word personal to myself, and to let you know, Sir, and the Senate know, that if it be fanaticism that I have uttered, I am not alone responsible for it. It is not peculiar to myself, Sir, nor those with whom I act. We had, a year or so ago, in the State, of New Hampshire, a pair of democratic organs and it was rather doubtful whether they were entirely harmonious. But in May, these New Hampshire "patriots" came together—they had an annexation—and when they came together they undertook to define the democratic faith upon this very doctrine of Slavery. I read from the "New Hampshire Patriot" of 27th May, 1847.

[Mr. Hale here read extracts from the New Hampshire Patriot, contending that the Democrats of slave States were friendly to abolition, and would ultimately effect it; but as we have not the paper, we do not undertake, to give the extracts.]

That is "New Hampshire Patriot" democracy—about twelve months old. So, if I am fanatical I am not without authority for my fanaticism; and a man may, it seems, entertain all the sentiments I have advanced without being cast out of the pale of the Democracy as it is now organized. But I leave the subject. I thank the Senate for the patience, kindness and candour with which I have been heard. It is no pleasant duty that I have performed. I is not agreeable to my feelings to occupy the place of an Ishmælite here; my hand being against every man's, and every man's hand against mine. If any remarks have fallen from me offensive to the feelings of a single Senator, of which I am wholly unconscious, I can assure him from the bottom of my heart that they were altogether unintentional. I have endeavoured to deal with principles and measures, not with men. I believe that the institutions of the country are endangered. I believe that the course in which we are proceeding, unless our career be arrested, will most inevitably conduct us to destruction; and I have thrown out these suggestions, in the hope of doing something, however feeble the attempt, in order to excite correct public sentiment on this all-vital question.

### Emancipation in St. Bartholomew.

We stated the fact in last week's Standard, of the abolition of Slavery in the Swedish Colony of St. Bartholomew. It gives us great pleasure now to lay the proclamation before our readers:

PROCLAMATION.

"We, JAMES H. HAASUM, Knight of the Royal Order of the Sword, Governor in and over this Island of St. Bartholomew, &c. &c. &c.

"JAMES H. HAASUM,

"Whereas the munificence of the States of the realm has rendered it possible to accomplish his Majesty's most gracious and elevated intention to effect, on fair and equitable grounds, the liberation of the slaves in this Island from that state of bondage in which they hitherto were held; and the slave owners, by their meritorious zeal to concur with his Majesty in the measure adapted for the purpose, and their readiness to meet his august and just expectations, have greatly facilitated the obtaining of a satisfactory result.

"Now, therefore, it becomes at this moment our bounden duty to impress on the mind of the emancipated people, that the majority of the Swedish nation, which has conferred on them this immense benefit, earns a livelihood only by laborious exertions in the hard struggle against a severe climate. The sacrifice was therefore great and magnanimous, and it is so much the more to be estimated, as it was rendered with the sole view of removing an impediment to the improvement of fellow Christians. That nation has consequently an indispensable right to require that those, who have profited by the generous boon, should show themselves worthy of such a munificence.

"We do also now confidently expect that the labouring classes now emancipated will always endeavour, by gratitude, labour, industry, and a becoming demeanour, to render their liberty a blessing to themselves as well as to the community. And we do furthermore call upon them to attend the morning services in the respective churches, to-morrow, Sunday, and then with humble hearts to offer up sincere thanks to Almighty God, for His great mercy, imploring Him to grant them power to make an honourable and Christian use of that liberty they now enjoy.

"Government House, Gustavia, Island of St. Bartholomew, this 9th day of October, 1847.

"J. A. UDDENBERG,
"Secretary of Govt."

PROCLAMATION.

"We, JAMES H. HAASUM, Knight of the Royal Order of

results of the abolition of Slavery. We shall make from it copious extracts, which justify that act of the British Government, considered merely as a question of political economy, as well as the more recent acts of other European powers, who are following with their own colonies, the noble example set them by the Government of Great Britain.

### Speeches in Congress—The Whig Party.

We occupy a large portion of this number with speeches made in Congress during the first week. The extract from Mr. Giddings's on the Amistad Case, places the proposed impudent and infamous support of the Foreign Slave Trade in a clear light. The proposal to pay certain Spanish pirates—for such they are by our laws—a loss on an unsuccessful piratical expedition, was worthy of the existing Government of the United States, and it should excite no one's surprise that the Whig House should reject Mr. Giddings's modest proposition, to refer the subject to a select Committe.

Mr. Calhoun's speech we give almost entire, leaving out only such passages in which the speaker illustrated at greater length, and with more force, some of his positions. It abounds with forcible and important truths, and would, from any other man, no doubt, exercise a strong influence at the South. But esteeming Mr. Calhoun, as we do, as the most independent, and most far-seeing Statesman of the times, we regret that he should be looked upon only as the representative of his peyper-corn State, South Carolina. The overthrow of the Slave-power, and of Slavery, may, perhaps, date from the day, when the United States shall avow her right to subjugate her neighbours from the love of conquest. Mr. Calhoun's ridiculous assertion—made in the face of the history of the whole world, till within a few hundred years—as to the capacity of the dark-complexioned races for self-government, may turn out to be a sad prophecy of the impossibility of a Government embracing races of such differing characters as the negro, the Indian, the mixed-Spanish, and the White.

To the speech of Mr. Hale, we need not call attention. We have omitted, and cut short, much other matter to make room for it in this paper, certain that great anxiety will be felt to hear from one who occupies so large a share of the public attention.

The Mexican War is the only subject of any consequence that is receiving the attention of Congress. One thing, at least, we wish the people might learn from the proceedings of both Houses, but especially that of Representatives—that the Whigs are no more opposed to the War, than the guerillas of Mexico are to sacking the baggage-wagon. The wonder is, that they believe they can deceive anybody; but that is eclipsed by the still greater wonder, that anybody should be deceived. The talk of Clay and Webster, and of all the lesser lights among the Whigs, who have followed their example, in denouncing the War, or the "lying Preamble," declared it the duty of the Government to withdraw the American forces from Mexico, is *vox et præterea nihil*. It means nothing, and is meant to signify nothing, but opposition to the other party, for presidential capital. As we stated last week, the Resolutions of Mr. Hudson, of Massachusetts, fairly tested the temper of the House. As they had not been received when we went to press last week, we publish them now, and earnestly ask for them the attention of our readers:

Resolved, That the Committee on Military Affairs be directed to inquire into the expediency of requesting the President of the United States to withdraw to the east branch of the Rio Grande, our army now in Mexico, and propose to the Mexican Government, forthwith, a treaty of peace, on the following terms, viz:—

1. That we will relinquish all claim for indemnity for the expenses of the war.
2. That the boundary between the two countries shall be established at or near the desert between the Nueces and the Rio Grande.
3. That Mexico shall be held to pay all just claims which existed against her at the commencement of the war.
4. That a Convention shall be entered into between the two nations to provide for the liquidation of said claims.

They were voted down by a majority of more than *three to one*—41 to 137—and this, be it remembered, where the Whigs are in the ascendancy. If they are opposed to the War—if they want to see it ended—if they want to do justice to Mexico—if they want the nation to take an honourable position—what would better answer the purpose than the propositions of Mr. Hudson? But what can be clearer than that, as a party, they are anxious, and determined to continue the war, notwithstanding their canting professions to the contrary?

Since the above vote was passed, the Whigs of the House have insulted the country again by the enactment of another contemptible farce, in a vote *against* the War. To a proposition to vote a gold medal to General Taylor, and thanks to those under him, Mr. Ashman proposed to add to the words, "Engaged as they were in upholding the rights and honour of the country:" the words, "in a war unnecessarily and unconstitutionally begun by the President of the United States." And this amendment was passed by a strict party vote of 85 to 81.

If "unnecessary and unconstitutional," why not end it? Only because that is precisely the thing they do not mean to do, and would, if necessary, prevent others from doing. The open corruption of the Democratic party, and their defence of the war as right, is refreshing and noble, after the sickening hypocrisy of the Whigs, under such leadership as the New York Tribune, and Boston Atlas.

### Governor Young's Message.

This lengthy document, which would half fill one side of our paper, we do not deem of importance enough to publish entire. Our readers, we presume, do not expect it. Those out of the State would consider it as spoiling good paper, and those in the State, would only care to pick out of it, here and there, a fact, which can be put in less space than six columns.

On the 30th of last month, the indebtedness of the State was as follows:—General Fund Debt, $6 139,840 86, Canal Debt, $16,743,749 57, the liability on account of Rail Roads, $1,563,000, making an aggregate of $24,446,590 57. The revenues from the Canals for the year ending 30th September, last, were $3,473,684 60. The expenses for the same period were $643,766 08, leaving a surplus revenue of $2,829,718 52. From this sum is to be deducted, $1,850,000, pledged by the Constitution to the enlargement of the Erie, and the completion of the Genesee Valley, and Black River Canals. The receipt of tolls since September last, amount to $1,419,423 75.

The amount of State Stocks, including the original issue, and nine month's interest on the Canal Debt, and deducting the amount redeemed, is $1,924,065 67. The amount derived from the Sinking Fund, and one tenth of the mill tax, for 1845, and 1846, is $1,102,548,51, leaving a deficiency unprovided for on the 1st of July, of $821,517,16.

The income for the last fiscal year of the United States Deposite Fund, was $262,370,76, and of the Common School Fund, $131,554,21. The amount paid for teachers, and rate bills for the last year, was $1,068,230 55. From the returns for the year ending 30th June last, the number of children between the ages of five and sixteen, is 700,443 and the number of children taught in the Common Schools during the same period was 748,347. During the last year therehas been paid for books $92,899 58, and there are now in the District Libraries 1,300,984. The amount from the interest on the Literary Fund, to, gether with that appropriated by the account of May last devoted to the support of Academies is $40,000.

The Governor suggests that some steps be taken by *State litigation* to settle the question of the Manorial Titles. He also recommends, that henceforth the Public Lands be sold only to actual settlers.

The Governor expresses the hope, that in case of any further requisitions of troops to carry on the war with Mexico, the Legislature will be prompt in making the necessary appropriations. He endorses, to the full extent, the doctrine of "our country, right or wrong." He seems to have a vague notion that it is of some consequence that a nation should do right, but he is entirely certain, that as long as she is enacting wrong, a true patriot will do all in his power to help her, and be silent as to the right, till such time as it shall please the rulers to cease the wrong-doing. The doctrine reduced to the simplest elements is this: A national wrong should be opposed before it is commenced, and after it is finished, in most unanswerable argument; but while it is committing we must do all we can to aid and abet it. To contemplate wrong is wrong, and deserving of condemnation, but to do wrong is right, and deserving of assistance. We do not find that the Governor makes any application of this sort of morality to any other public villainy than that of the Mexican War, or offers any such assistance to the private rascality which distinguishes most of the volunteers before their enlistment.

### The Old Way and the New.

That excellent representative of the Christianity of the United States, the A. B. C. F. M. has a way of its own of converting such Heathen as it thinks worth the trouble. If it is loose in its estimation of the crime of bigamy in some places, it makes up for it in severity towards a kindred crime in others. Sin, with it, is a question of latitude, and we should not be at all surprised at its missionaries condemning slaveholders to death, where it could be done with impunity. Everything depends upon circumstances. The Boston Times makes the following edifying statement:

SANDWICH ISLANDS.—A correspondent of the *Elele*, a newspaper published in the native language, under the direction of the American missionaries, complains of the amount of prostitution in Lahaine, and Honolulu, and sends an urgent appeal to the editor, the *Rev.* Richard Armstrong, in these works:—"Go you to the chiefs.—You, ask, where are the chiefs? I make known to you that the privy council are the chiefs at the present time. You, together with them, devise some measures for suppressing this offence. You say to this privy council, make a new law."

The editor, in reply to this appeal, suggests the following for a law, to be rigidly enforced:—

"For the first offence of moe kolohe, all the property of the offender shall be confiscated to the Government, and he or she be flogged with a rope, and confined for a time in irons.

"For the second offence, the offender shall be taken to the ocean, *and held under water till as nearly dead as possible*; then allowed to recover breath, and *again submerged in the same manner—this operation to be repeated five times, if endurable*, and the convict then banished to another land.

"For the third offence, the offender shall be *hanged until dead*, according to the word of God. Leviticus, xx. 10."

This short method with sinners reminds us very forcibly of another story, told in the book referred to by the Rev. Editor, and which is so much read, so little understood, and made responsible for so many sorts of wickedness. We copy it, and commend it, by way of contrast, to the attention of any of the members or missionaries of the A. B. C. F. M. who care enough for any of the Heathen this side of the Atlantic or Pacific Oceans, to read an Anti-Slavery paper:

And the Scribes and Pharisees brought unto him a woman, taken in adultery; and when they had set her in the midst,

They said unto him, Master, this woman was taken in adultery, in the very act.

Now, Moses, in the law, commanded us, that such should be stoned: but what sayest thou?

This they said, tempting him, that they might have to accuse him. But Jesus stooped down, and with his finger wrote on the ground, as though he heard them not.

So when they continued asking him, he lifted up himself, and said unto them, He that is without sin among you, let him first cast a stone at her.

And again he stooped down and wrote on the ground.

And they which heard it, being convicted by their own conscience, went out one by one, beginning at the eldest, even unto the last: and Jesus was left alone, and the woman standing in the midst.

When Jesus had lifted up himself, and saw none but the woman, he said unto her, woman, where are those thine accusers? hath no man condemned thee?

She said, no man, Lord.

And Jesus said unto her, Neither do I condemn thee: go, and sin no more.

### The Secretary of the American Unitarian Association an ex-Slaveholder.

According to a statement made in the last Christian World, in reply to an article in the Liberator, the Secretary of the American Unitarian Association, the Rev. Mr. Elliot, late of St. Louis, was, till quite recently, a slaveholder. He became so, however, according to the "World," from purely disinterested and benevolent motives. At her own earnest entreaty, he purchased a woman, to prevent her being sold down the river; and at the same time made such an arrangement, that, her wages were passed to her credit, till they amounted to the sum he had advanced for her, when she was to become free. In the meantime, she was legally his property.

The benevolence of the act amounts to this: that the Rev. Mr. Elliot consented to advance a few hundred dollars to a woman—perhaps a member of his own church—to save her from a fate infinitely worse than death. But in order to secure this investment in human flesh and bones, he held the woman as his property, to him and his heirs. It was a small loan, at best, without interest, perhaps with, according to the laws of the State, the most ample security. We confess, however, strange it may seem to the editor of the World, that if Mr. Elliot's title to the character of a benovelent man, rests on no broader foundation than such a transaction, we have very little admiration to spare for it. Such cases are, by no means, uncommon among slaveholders.

In the meantime, before the woman's wages amounted to her value in the human shambles of St. Louis,—a period of years, probably—the Rev. Mr. Elliot was a slaveholder. He had bought his sister in the Lord, for a price, and held her as a slave. His motive was a good one; and so was the Rev. Dr. Ely's, whose "boy" is now—if he has not already reached the end of the allotted term of seven years, of life granted, by calculation, to a slave at the Southwest—dragging out his miserable existence on a plantation down the river. It was the good luck of Mr. Elliot's slave that saved her from a similar fate. By making her a loan, he gave her a chance of being a free woman. As it turned out it was a good speculation for her, and her master lost nothing by it. If she had died, he would have lost his money, or a part of it. If he had died, or become insolvent, she would have lost the money she had already paid towards her own purchase of her Reverend owner, and been a slave still. If, on the other hand, he had paid the price demanded for her, and made her free at the moment, by refusing to become her owner, trusting to her to pay the amount advanced, the act would have been one of true benevolence.—As it was, we think there is better reason for congratulating the woman that her master was spared to be Secretary of the Unitarian Association, than there is for congratulating the Association in its choice of a Secretary.

A "BOLD DRAGOON."—Col. Harney, of the Dragoons, whose praise is in all the papers, as one who has distinguished himself in Mexico by his bravery, is now in Washington, and is, says one of the letter-writers, "like most men of real merit, modest and unassuming in his deportment." The Christian World puts the modest merit of this bold dragoon in a striking light. The most distinguished act of his Mexican Campaign was the hanging of the Irish deserters; and this cruel and savage transaction, unparalleled in the history of any civilized nation, seems natural enough when we learn, that this Harney, as the World asserts, is the very man who, a few years since, in St. Louis, tortured a woman to death with hot irons, or the whip, and drove her husband, by the fear of similar treatment, to self-destruction. The account of this transaction is given in Weld's "Slavery As It Is," in a letter of Mr. Nathan Cole, a man whose word is not to be doubted. It is as follows:

Mr. Nathan Cole, of St. Louis, Missouri, in a letter to Mr. Arthur Tappan, of New-York, dated July 2, 1834, says—

"You will find enclosed an account of the proceedings of an inquest lately held in this city upon the body of a slave, the details of which, if published, not one in ten could be induced to believe true.* It appears that the master or mistress, or both, suspected the unfortunate wretch of hiding a bunch of keys which were missing; and to extort some explanation, which, it is more than probable, the slave was as unable to do, as her mistress, or any other person, her master, Major Harney, an officer of our army, had her whipped for three successive days, and it is supposed by some, that she was kept tied during the time, until her flesh was so lacerated and torn, that it was impossible for the jury to say whether it had been done with the whip or hot iron; some think both—but she was tortured to death. It appears also that the husband of the said slave had become suspected of telling some neighbour what was going on, for which Major Harney commenced torturing him, until the man broke from him, and ran into the Mississippi and drowned himself. The man was a pious and very industrious slave, perhaps not surpassed by any in this place. The woman has been in the family of John Shackford, Esq. the present door-keeper of the Senate of the United States, for many years; was considered an excellent servant—was the mother of a number of children—and I believe was sold into the family where she met her fate, as matter of conscience, to keep her from being sent below."

*The following is the newspaper notice referred to:

An inquest was held at the dwelling-house of Major Harney, in this city on the 27th instant, by the coroner, on the body of Hannah, a slave. The jury, on their oaths, and after hearing the testimony of physicians and several other witnesses, found, that the said slave "came to her death by wounds inflicted by William S. Harney."

Such is the stuff of which Mexican heroes are made.

MR ROGERS'S PROPERTY AGAIN.—The Boston Chronotype says, on the authority of the Lynn Pioneer, that Henry C. Wright has in his possession a certificate from a New Hampshire Judge of Probate, that N. P. Rogers died possessed of an estate of $23,000. This, we take it, is evidence that cannot be gainsaid, and settles a question which will help some of our friends to a right understanding of other matters connected with the same person.

### Notes on New Books.

*Poems by James Russell Lowell. Second Series. Cambridge: Published by George Nichols.* Boston: B. B. Murray & Co.: 1848.

Most of these poems have appeared in the newspapers, and are familiar to our readers. They have already won their way to popular favour, and will be welcomed as old and familiar friends. It is rare for one so young as Lowell to earn his place so early among a nation's poets, but he is firmly seated as among the very first of this country. One need not be a prophet to predict that the day is not far distant when he will be acknowledged as the chiefest. He is a poet not only of the present, but of the future; and in his stirring anti-slavery lyrics proves how well he understands the mission of the true poet, and the want of to-day in his own country. Among the poems of this volume, which are here published for the first time, the "Changeling,"—which will be found on our outside—cannot escape the notice of the reader. As a whole it is very beautiful, and some parts of it are as full of a tender and touching sorrow, as anything we have ever read.

*Blackwood's Magazine, for December.*—The present number of Blackwood is the last of the American edition of the present volume. An arrangement, we understand, is completed between Messrs. Scott & Co. and the Edinburgh publishers, by which the reprint is to be discontinued, and the original edition to take its place.

The best, and the leading article is an admirably written review of the prose works of Emerson. The reception which Mr. Emerson has met abroad, and the assertion in Blackwood of his remarkable though uneven power as a writer, will probably secure him, at home, a consideration, that has never yet been awarded him. His unquestionable genius is not recognized by his own countrymen. "How I came to be a Sloven," an amusing essay upon dress; "An Unpublished French Novel;" "The Widow of Glencoe," a tale of cruel massacre in the Highlands in 1692; "The Pyrenees;" "Judaism in the Legislature;" "Pæans of the Athenian Navy;" "Our Currency, our Trade, and our Tariff," a high Tory paper, are the remaining articles.

*Howitt's Journal, for December.* Crosby & Nichols, Boston; Francis & Co. New York, Agents.

This number is decidedly an improvement on any that have preceded it. To all Abolitionists it will be peculiarly valuable for an excellent portrait of the late Thomas Clarkson, with a brief sketch of his life. Mr. Howitt continues his papers on British India, and we are glad to see a Journal of so extensive a circulation as we presume this to be, taking so decided a stand upon this important question. The articles on Capital Punishment, by Frederick Rowton, are full of valuable facts on that subject. The Weekly Record of important events, the Tales, and Poetry, are all well selected, or well written. From the Record we copy the following characteristic letter from Frederick Douglass to Miss Griffiths, which will interest our readers:

LYNN, (Mass.) October 13, 1847.

*Kind Friend*: Please accept my warmest and sincerest thanks, and extend the same to the many kind friends who co-operated with you in presenting to me the most excellent and valuable collection of books, pamphlets, tracts, and pictures, which through your own persevering industry, have just come to hand.

Words are too weak and insipid to express the depth or intensity of my gratitude for this valuable and appropriate testimonial. I am as well pleased with the manner as the matter of your noble present. *Free* from all embarrassing compacts and agreements, it comes the free gift of free and confiding hearts. Such a gift, in my estimation, outweighs millions, all girt about with provisions, importing a bargain. If it be more blessed to give than to receive, you have your reward, and it must be great to exceed mine.

You will the more readily understand my pleasure at receiving such a gift, when I tell you that but a few years ago, the fingers now penning this note of thanks, were used in fishing from the muddy street gutters of Baltimore, scattered pages of the Bible, that I might learn its precious contents. Had any one given me a Testimonial then, I should have felt myself blest, indeed. What a contrast is my present with my former condition! Then a slave, now a free man; then degraded, now respected; then ignorant, despised, neglected, unknown, and unfriended, my name unheard of beyond the narrow limits of a republican slave plantation; now, my friends and benefactors, people of both hemispheres. To heaven the praise belongs!

Again, dear friend, accept my thanks, and in a very especial manner extend them to Wm. and Mary Howitt, Sergeant Talfourd, Dr. Bowring, Mrs. Gilpin, to Messrs. Chambers, and others, who kindly contributed to assist you in making me this valuable present. With my best thanks also receive my humble assurance that the cause on behalf of which you have become interested in my welfare, shall never be deserted or betrayed by me.

With sincere gratitude, I am very respectfully yours,
F. DOUGLASS.

*The People's Journal* for December has not reached us, but we presume, from notices we have seen of it in other papers, that it maintains its character.

*The Child's Friend.* Eliza Lee Follen, Editor.—This little monthly is, as we have before said, the most excellent periodical of the kind with which we are acquainted, and must be gladly welcomed by its youthful readers.—Its character could not be other than it is under the care of Mrs. Follen. Besides the excellent original articles, which are always good, and generally convey some practical truth, there are frequent translations from entertaining and instructive French and German works, which give to it additional interest and value.

### This Week's Paper.

FOURTH PAGE.—*Poetry*: The Changeling. *Miscellany*: The Daughters of Magdalen; A Rival to Ether—Chloroform; Religious Freedom; The Downfall of India Rubber; Extract from a Letter of Kant: Women vs. Ladies; A Pardon—For Nothing; Gleanings from Foreign Papers.

FIRST PAGE.—*Pro slavery*: Report of the Senate of South Carolina; Frederick Douglass. *Selections*: The Amistad Case; The Slave Trade in Virginia; Greek and Slavery; Gen. Cass's Letter; Speech of John C. Calhoun.

SECOND PAGE.—Speech of John P. Hale; Emancipation in St. Bartholomew.

### Married.

In Walworth, Wayne county, (N. Y.) on the 29th of December, 1847, by Wells B. Fuller, Esq. Mr. WILLIAM HOWLAND to Miss PHEBE JANE SMITH, all of Walworth.

### Died.

In Williamson, Wayne county, (N. Y.) on the morning of the 21st of December, of typhus fever, ELIZA A. youngest daughter of Griffith M. and Eliza M. Cooper, aged 20 years 6 months and 8 days.

On the morning of the 29th ultimo, MARY MASTER, widow of the late William Master, in the 78th year of her age.

## GENERAL INTELLIGENCE.

### Foreign.

WASHINGTON, Jan. 9th, 1848.

*Recall of Gen. Scott—Trial of Gens. Worth and Pillow, and Col. Duncan—Absent Officers Ordered to Mexico.*—Gen. Scott is said to have been recalled from Mexico:—The name of his successor has not transpired. Rumour mentions several Generals, but the one who received the appointment, if any, is not yet known.

Generals Worth and Pillow, and Col. Duncan have been ordered to Vera Cruz, where a Court Martial has been convened to try them upon the charges which caused their arrest by Gen. Scott.

Orders have been received from Gen. Scott, requesting officers of the army now in the United States, on leave of absence, to return to the seat of war at the earliest practicable day, and resume their respective commands in the army.

I give you the above news as I received it, upon authority generally believed reliable. It is currently circulated and credited throughout the city. H.

Hon. WASHINGTON HUNT, of New York, has been confined by sickness for some days to his bed.—*Tribune.*

### General Items.

*Gone to Hayti.*—Mr. George B. Vashon, a young coloured man left Pittsburg on Wednesday last for Hayti.—Mr. V. studied law with Hon. Walter Forward, but owing to Pennsylvania's peculiar institutions, could not be permitted to practice in our courts, and has thus been forced to leave the scenes of childhood, his friends and his kindred, in order to have the liberty of following an honest vocation. Mr. V. we understand has already received the appointment of Secretary of the Republic, at a very comfortable salary.—*Penn. Paper.*

*Cold Water for Burns.*—Mr. Seth Hunt, of Northampton gives the following statement of the success of treating with cold water a severe burn and scald in his family:

"Cold water was applied, by immersion, till the pain ceased; the water being changed as often as it became warm. The part was then kept swathed with wet bandages, a dry woolen one enveloping them, until the injury was healed. The healing was rapid, and effected without leaving a scar. The instant relief which the cold water gave from the exeruciating pain was highly gratifying."

*A Notice.*—We received yesterday a notice that our property in Maiden-lane has been assessed 3300 with information that the said assessment had been "confirmed," and that payment would be received "in money current at the several banks in this city." We have to say most decidedly that we shall not pay. First, because we cannot determine certainly what the amount is, as it is only stated in figures. Secondly because we have no faith in mere confirmation. If the thing be unsound in itself, whether it be man, or beast, or whatever else, mere confirmation, by whatever hands performed, mere ceremony, coming to nothing; therefore this matter of the Maiden-lane, being altogether unsound, hypocritical, rotten, and unseemly odor, from the beginning, confirmation cannot cure its defects. And lastly, because we do not own any property in Maiden-lane.—*Journal of Commerce.*

*The Hindoo Girl.*—The following interesting fact was stated in a recent lecture by Mr. Pierpont:

At the present day the uneducated Hindoo girl by the use of her hands simply, could surpass the delicacy and fineness of texture, productions of the most perfect machinery, in the manufacture of cotton and muslin cloths. In England, cotton has been made so fine that it would require a thread 490 miles in length to weigh a pound—but the Hindoo girl had by her hands constructed a thread which would require to be extended 1,000 miles to weigh a pound; and the Deccale muslin of her manufacture, when spread on the ground and covered with dew, are no longer visible.

*Fugitive Slaves.*—A bill to prevent kidnapping in Ohio, or rather to prevent the arrest of fugitive slaves has been introduced into the Legislature of that State.—Its principal provisions are,

"It prohibits, under the penalty of imprisonment in the Penitentiary not less than one, or more than five years, any person in this State not a public officer of the United States, aiding or assisting in any way the arrest or removal of a fugitive slave.

*Secondly.* It prohibts under a like punishment any or other officer acting under the laws of this State imprisoning in the jail or any other place a fugitive slave.

*Thirdly.* It inflicts the same punishment upon any person who shall in any way procure any person to go out of the State with the intent of enslaving such person."

The character of the proposed law is nearly or quite similar to that which exists in Pennsylvania.

The New England committee for the relief of the distressed poor of Ireland and Scotland, have received contributions to the amount of $151,007 05.

☞ We learn from the *Salem Register*, that Richard Fletcher, of Boston has been nominated by Gov. Briggs is an Associate Justice of the Supreme Court, in place of Judge Hubbard, deceased.

☞ On Sunday a lady called to her little boy who was tossing marbles on the sidewalk, to come into the house. "Dont you know you shouldn't be out there, my son? Go into the back yard if you want to play marbles—it is Sunday." "Well, yes. But ain't it Sunday *in the back yard*, mother?"

*Inpongwe Grammar.*—A grammar of this language, spoken by the the negroes at Gaboon, Western Africa, and lately reduced to a written system by missionaries of the American Board at that station, has been printed with vocabularies, at New York, at the expense of the Board.

This grammar exhibits the wonderful fact, that these naked savages are possessed of a language *rivalling the Greek* in copiousness and flexibility. Of course the language of so rude a people must be expected to he deficient in words representing abstract ideas—but its susceptibilities may be seen, from the structure of the verbs, which admit modifications to express almost every shade of meaning. Thus *kamba*, to speak; *kambaga* to speak habitually; *kambiza*, tocause to speak; *kambina*, to speak to or for some one; *kambagamba*, to speak at random. And these terminations may be so combined as to make six other significant forms, as *kambinaza*, to cause to speak for some one. And yet again, each of these has an active, and a passive, a positive and a negative form.—*Miss. Herald.*

*Father Mathew.*—The Journal of the American Temperance Union, publishes a letter from Father Mathew, by the following extract from which it appears that he will be present at the May anniversaries:

I shall, please God, leave Ireland, for my mission to the United States early in the ensuing Spring; and should circumstances permit, I shall with pleasure and thankfulness avail myself of the proffered invitation of Messrs. Grinnell, Minturn, & Co. to sail under the command of that zealous friend and supporter of our cause, Captain Knight, of whose acquaintance I feel proud. I hope to reach New York in time for your anniversary meeting.

*Killing a Negro.*—On Sunday morning, on the farm of Colonel Ormsby, near this city, Mr. Robert Sherley killed an old negro man named Patrick. No one was present except Mr. Sherley and some negroes, and the following are the circumstances as related by Mr. Sherley. Patrick, who lived in town, was drunk and quarrelling, and Mr. S. was sent for to restore tranquillity. When he came into the cabin, his authority was resisted, and after some blows were aimed and parried, Mr. S. walked out of the cabin, followed by the negro, who drew a pistol, swearing that he would shoot him. Mr. S. drew a six-barrel revolver, and fired twice, both balls entering the negro's body, causing his death in half an hour. Patrick's pistol appears to have been fired. The cock, fifteen minutes after, was found down, the pistol empty, and the interior of the barrel discoloured with burnt powder. Yesterday Mr. Sherley voluntarily appeared before two Justices of the Peace, John Doup and John Herr, who discharged him, believing the homicide justifiable.—*Louisville Journal, Dec. 29.*

*Slave Trade.*—By a Parliamentary paper yesterday printed, an estimate is given of the expense of her Majesty's ships-of-war employed for the suppression of the Slave Trade and of all their appointments, so as to exhibit the aggregate charge to the country for their support in the years 1846–7. The aggregate charge is returned at £301,623, comprising four items. The estimate of the expense of the wages and victuals of the ships-of-war employed in the suppression of the Slave Trade is £220,233; the estimate of the wear and tear of the hulls, &c. £49,313; the estimate of the wear and tear of the machinery of steam vessels, £17,790; and the estimate of the value of coals provided for the use of steam-vessels, £14,287, making the aggregate charge above stated.—*London Times.*

*A Lynx in Sharon.*—It is said one of the black lynx kind, is prowling about in the woods in Sharon, New Hampshire. He has been seen near the steam-mill.

☞ Hon. Tristam Burgess is publishing letters in the *Providence Journal* on the boundary, in which he admits that six towns—Cumberland, Barrington, Warren, Bristol, Tiverton and Little Compton—should be transferred back from Rhode Island to Massachuseits.

The Rev. John Weiss was installed pastor of the First Congregational Society in New Bedford, on Wednesday last. Sermon by Rev. Ephraim Peabody, of Boston.

☞ Any person of good moral character, although not admitted and licensed as an Attorney, may now practice in the Courts of this State. The only distinction between such a practitioner and one regularly licensed, is that the former must show a special power of Attorney in each case.

### ACKNOWLEDGMENTS.

*For the Standard—from Dec. 27, 1847, to Jan. 8, 1848.*

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 447 | Ann Feeler, Constantia, N Y | $1 00 |
| 447 | James S. Douglass " | 1 00 |
| 447 | J. D. Chittenden, Central Square, N Y | 1 00 |
| 447 | Joseph Cooper, " | 1 00 |
| 447 | Dr. J. Marble, " | 1 00 |
| 447 | Alvan Briggs, " | 1 00 |
| 447 | B. G. Lewis, " | 1 00 |
| 447 | Charles Raymond, " | 1 00 |
| 447 | Robert L. Lawson, Hastings, N Y | 1 00 |
| 447 | Rev. A. Foreman, Richland, N Y | 1 00 |
| 447 | Wm. W. Paine, " | 1 00 |
| 447 | John Holmes, South Richland, N Y | 1 00 |
| 447 | Isaac Wright, New York, | 1 00 |
| 447 | Geo. W. Robinson, Baldwinsville, N Y | 1 00 |
| 445 | John Furlong, Clyde, N Y | 1 00 |
| 432 | John G. Neil, Showhegan, Me | 1 00 |
| 433 | S. Smith, West Harwich, Mass | 1 00 |
| 446 | E. Starkweather, Mexicoville, N Y | 1 00 |
| 446 | Kittle & Kilty, " | 1 00 |
| 446 | Minerva Ames, " | 1 00 |
| 446 | Solomon Peck, " | 1 00 |
| 446 | T. W. Peck, New Haven, N Y | 1 00 |
| 445 | Hezekiah Nichols, " | 1 00 |
| 416 | Levi Laing, Waterloo, N Y | 1 00 |
| 433 | R. P. Mosher, " | 1 00 |
| 416 | Joseph Willey, " | 1 00 |
| 385 | Benjamin Tripps, Marengo, N Y | 1 00 |
| 432 | F. C. Mansfield, Warren, Mass | 1 00 |
| 419 | Stephen Barker, Methuen, Mass | 1 00 |
| 447 | George Bradlee, Lowell Mass | 1 00 |
| 447 | Jasper Dumass, Hanibalville, N Y | 1 00 |
| 447 | Zenas Haven, " | 1 00 |
| 447 | John Draper, " | 1 00 |
| 447 | James D. Curtis, " | 1 00 |
| 447 | Hiram B. Lewis, Oswego, N Y | 1 00 |
| 447 | Seymor Coe, " | 1 00 |
| 447 | Willet Washburn, " | 1 00 |
| 396 | S. Hewlett, Hempstead, N Y | 25 |
| 521 | Cyrus Pierce, West Newton, Mass | 2 00 |
| 468 | Rev. J. F. Clarke, Boston, | 1 00 |
| 416 | Lucelia Tarbox, Brooklyn, Ct. | 1 00 |
| 447 | Wm. Greene, Wilkesville, O | 1 00 |
| 396 | George M. Rodgers, Boston, Mass | 1 75 |
| 496 | A. L. Haskell, Chelsea, Mass | 4 44 |
| 392 | M. Knowles, Tottington, | 1 62 |
| 457 | Miss Hildrith, Wrexham, Wales, | 1 62 |
| 507 | Matthew Walton, Manchester, | 2 62 |
| 510 | James Haughton, Dublin, Ireland | 5 00 |
| 441 | Francis Bishop, Exeter, England | 1 62 |
| 469 | Miss Henzell, Carrick, Irelahd | 81 |
| 495 | Joseph Barker, | 2 25 |
| 468 | Richard Allen, Dublin, Ireland, | 1 62 |
| 487 | Isabel Jennings, (for 1846,) Cork, Ire. | 2 83 |
| | Cork Society, (2 copies,) | 5 66 |
| | Jane Jennings, 1847, | 1 62 |
| | Cork Society, 2 copies, do. | 3 25 |
| 448 | Miss Fair, | 1 62 |
| | | 80 58 |

### DONATIONS.

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Collections (by E.D.H.) at Lansingville, N Y | | 1 50 |
| " " at Unadilla, N Y | | 1 18 |
| " " at Trenton, N Y | | 4 78 |
| S. J. May, jr. Boston, on account pledge, | | 10 00 |
| | | 17 46 |
| Total, | | $98 04 |

FRANCIS JACKSON, Treasurer.

☞ NOTICE.—By the post-office law now in force, publishers of newspapers are permitted to send, in their papers to subscribers, bills *unreceipted*; but a *receipted* bill subjects the receiver to letter postage. Our subscribers, therefore, will find a bill, unreceipted of course, in their papers at the expiration of the time to which they have paid. The amount received for subscription is acknowledged above, and the *whole number* of the paper to which each subscriber has paid precedes his name.

## NOTICES.

### ANNUAL MEETING OF THE MASSACHUSETTS ANTI-SLAVERY SOCIETY.

The Annual Meeting of the Massachusetts Anti-Slavery Society will be held in Boston on WEDNESDAY and THURSDAY, January 26th and 27th, commencing at 10 o'clock, A. M. Its members and friends, and all who feel an interest in the paramount question of American Slavery, are strongly urged to give their attendance. If, in the eventful history of this country, there ever was a time for those who profess to be the friends of Freedom, to rally promptly and openly under her banner, and to grudge nothing of time or money in the vindication of her sacred cause, that time is assuredly the present. The great question of DISUNION—of a withdrawal of the Free from the Slave States—will be prominent in the discussions of the meeting. The motto of every Christian and Patriot should be—"NO UNION WITH SLAVEHOLDERS!"

FRANCIS JACKSON, Pres't.
EDMUND QUINCY, Sec'y.

### WILLIAM. S. BROWN,

An Agent for the Massachusetts Anti-Slavery Society, will lecture as follows:

Leominster, Saturday January, 8.
Lancaster, Tuesday " 11.
Boston, Thursday " 13.

### STEPHEN S. FOSTER,

An Agent for the Massachusetts Anti-Slavery Society will lecture as follows:

At Blackstone, Saturday evening and Sunday, January 8th and 9th.
At Malboro', Tuesday and Wednesday, January 11th and 12th.
At Northboro', Thursday and Friday, 13th and 14th.

### PARKER PILLSBURY,

An Agent for the Massachusetts Anti-Slavery Society, will lecture as follows:

At Plymouth, Sunday January, 9th.
At Duxbury, Tuesday " 11th.
At Pembroke, Thursday " 13th.

### OLD COLONY ANTI-SLAVERY SOCIETY!

A quarterly meeting of the Plymouth County (Old Colony,) A. S. Society, will be holden in the *Free Church (Town Hall) in Abington*, on the first Saturday and Sunday in January, 1848, commencing at 10 o'clock, and continuing through each day and evening.

We trust the friends of the Society will assemble in round and goodly numbers. We invite also the apologist, the indifferent, and the enslaver, to meet with us and take part in our deliberations. An interesting meeting is anticipated as Stephen S. Foster, Parker Pillsbury, Samuel May, Jr. and others, will be present.

H. H. BRIGHAM, Secretary,
S. Abington, Dec. 10, 1847.

### CONVENTION AT PINEVILLE, PA.

An Anti-Slavery Convention will be held in Pineville Hall, on Saturday and Sunday January 15th and 16th, commencing at 2 o'clock, P. M. C. M. Burleigh, Mary Grew, and other speakers will probably be present.

### INFORATION WANTED

Of Lionel Jackson a coloured boy of seventeen years of age, who left Northampton, (Mass.) in October last in company with his mother. On the 26th of October they took passage on board the canal boat Wilson, at Albany, for Syracuse, on their way to Oswego, whither they were going. While the boat was lying at the pier between light and nine o'clock in the evening, the boy went on shore, and told his mother he would return immediately, since which time he has not been heard of. The boy had on when he left the boat an iron-gray overcoat, checkered pantaloons and a tarpauling hat. He has a scar over each eye, squints slightly, comparatively light complexion for a coloured person. He left his best clothes and twenty dollars in money with his mother. Any information respecting the boy will be thankfully received by his afflicted mother, Susan Jackson, Schenectady.

### WINDHAM COUNTY A.S. SOCIETY.

On Tuesday, January 18th, 1848, the friends of the slave in Windham county, will hold a Convention at Williamantic, commencing at 10 o'clock, A. M. and continuing through the day and evening.

Henry C. Wright and John M. Spear, will attend and address the meeting.

Friends of humanity, listen to this call and respond to it by a general attendance.

The cause of human freedom demands efforts, zealous and earnest at our hands; who will turn aside from the high and holy obligations of duty to the oppressed?

In behalf of the Society,
JAMES B. WHITCOMB, Pres.
Lucian Burleigh, Sec.

### ANTI-SLAVERY FAIR AT WEST WINFIELD

*On January 26th and 27th, 1848.*

The friends of the slave are invited to make preparations for our next Fair, to be held at the time above mentioned. There is no time to be lost. The slave is still toiling, toiling, toiling,—hopeless, helpless, desolate.—Woman,—aye, a million of women are even now given up to the tender mercies of the palefaced oppressor. In the name of these outraged ones, we ask each and all of you to do something,—do what you can, do all that you can, to hasten their deliverance. Ask your neighbours to help you. Many of them will willingly give their aid if you will only invite them. Prejudice is giving way. A spirit of inquiry is abroad. Freedom is gaining ground. Now is the time for effort.

Charles Lenox Remond, E. D. Hudson, Lewis Hayden, J. C. Hathaway, and other speakers will be present.

| | |
|---|---|
| Dolly Thomas | Miranda A. E. Greene |
| Sarah Guild | Phebe Backus |
| Hannah Bucklin | Laura Eldred |
| Emeline Murdock | Julia Ann Eaton |
| Henrietta Bisby | Laura Turner |
| Eveline Rider | Sophlora Thomas |
| Alpha Thomas | Laura Colburn |
| Susan Brown | Amanda Harding. |

# Poetry.

## THE CHANGELING.

BY JAMES RUSSELL LOWELL.

I had a little daughter,
And she was given to me
To lead me gently backward
To the Heavenly Father's knee,
That I, by the force of nature,
Might in some dim wise divine
The depth of his infinite patience,
To this wayward soul of mine.

I know not how others saw her,
But to me she was wholly fair,
And the light of the heaven she came from
Still lingered and gleamed in her hair;
For it was as wavy and golden,
And as many changes took,
As the shadows of sun-gilt ripples
On the yellow bed of a brook.

To what can I liken her smiling
Upon me, her kneeling lover,
How it leaped from her lips to her eyelids,
And dimpled her wholly over,
Till her outstretched hands smiled also,
And I almost seemed to see
The very heart of her mother
Sending sun through her veins to me!

She had been with us scarce a twelvemonth,
And it hardly seemed a day,
When a troop of wandering angels
Stole my little daughter away;
Or perhaps these heavenly Zincali
But loosed the hampering strings,
And when they had opened her cage-door,
My little bird used her wings.

But they left in her stead a changeling,
A little angel child,
That seems like her bud in full blossom,
And smiles as she never smiled:
When I wake in the morning, I see it
Where she always used to lie,
And I feel as weak as a violet
Alone 'neath the awful sky;

As weak, yet as trustful also,
For the whole year long I see
All the wonders of faithful Nature,
Still worked for the love of me;
Winds wander, and dews drip earthward,
Rain falls, suns rise and set,
Earth whirls, and all but to prosper
A poor little violet.

This child is not mine as the first was,
I cannot sing it to rest,
I cannot lift it up fatherly
And bless it upon my breast;
Yet it lies in my little one's cradle
And sits in my little one's chair,
And the light of the heaven she's gone to
Transfigures her golden hair.

# Miscellany.

From the Last Incarnation.

## THE DAUGHTERS OF MAGDALEN.

Shortly after this, the Christ remembered the woman of Samaria and Magdalen the sinner, to whom many sins were forgiven because she had loved much. And he, who had not disdained to descend even into hell, to deliver the souls of those whom he had ransomed, went in the evening through the streets of the great city, seeking the poor sinning women.

And on seeing them wander about by the light of the lamps, with a smile on their lips and death in their heart, with flowers on their brow and their feet in the mud, he wept, thinking of Mary. And he looked at them with ineffable sadness, at the thought that each of those unfortunates had a soul and a heart.

One of them having approached him, he looked at her sorrowfully, and said: "My daughter, what do you desire of me?"

"That thou wouldst forgive me," replied she; for she had recognized him.

Jesus said to her: "You know me because you have suffered much—poor child, what can I do for you? I can forgive you, but how can I enable you to forgive yourself? Did not my father create you to live pure, and to become a mother? How, then, have you fallen into this horribly abject condition?"

"Because I could no longer live, and because I had not strength to die," replied the poor woman, weeping.

"And in order to live you have condemned yourself to die every day," said Jesus to her; "what, then, did you find so desirable in life?"

"Master," returned she, "when men pay me that they may outrage me, it is not I who am guilty of the evil which they do to me; but if I had laid violent hands on myself, I should have been obliged to answer before God for the crime of my death."

"Woman, you reason justly," said Jesus. "You were weak, and society did not support you: therefore, you are a living accusation against it, and each of your humiliations shall be punished as a homicide. For each of those men who think they can possess you for a vile price, has had a mother; and he does not reflect that heaven had destined you also to be a mother. He has perhaps had a sister, and he does not reflect that you might be his sister.—Sometimes he has even a betrothed; and he does not ask himself what he would suffer if any one should thus degrade his betrothed. For every woman is a betrothed of humanity, and to each of them had God destined a husband.

"Withdraw, therefore, from me, O, my poor child! for my presence does you harm, and covers you with shame: you would wish to love me, and you dare not look upon me, because I am the pure man, and you are the poor, degraded woman.

"No, do not look at me, poor humiliated woman; but look at my image nailed to the cross, and hope. For I do not break the bruised reed, and I do not tread under foot the still smoking flax.

"The world despises you, because it has made you impure, and it despised me because I was pure. You see then that its judgments are iniquitous, and that they ought not to drive you to despair.

"Poor creature! who, because you were weak, suffer now what would terrify the strongest natures! Do not fear my reproaches; I do not wish to add them to the regrets of your heart. The world has broken you, that is why I will have pity on you. When I was expiring on the cross, I saw at my feet Magdalen, the sinner; and I was happy to die for her. For I love those whom the world abandons, and I bless those whom it outrages.

"Depart my daughter; and enclose your sorrow in your soul, like a hope. Weep inwardly, when the sad necessities of your life compel you to smile; for you have no chastity henceforth but in the tears of your heart.

"Never prostitute your soul, in order that your body may be purified by destruction; and that the remembrance of your fall may perish with your perishable form in the forgetfulness of the grave. The soul is immortal, and its sorrowful aspirations after virtue will live with it; the body is mortal, and the faults which come from it and are attached to it will go with it into death.

"Poor angel fallen into hell, be not therefore tired with looking towards heaven, and do not despair of your salvation, for those who have destroyed you are more criminal than you; and you would have a right to cry out for vengeance against them."

"I forgive them," replied the woman, "for if they were better they would be happier; and how could they have been good to me, when they do not yet know how to be good to themselves?"

"Go in peace, my daughter, and hope for your deliverance," then, said the Christ. "You have not been virtuous, and perhaps that is the world's fault more than your own; but you are good, and that belongs to your heart and the world cannot take it from you. God will forgive you as you forgive those who have injured you. Be courageous, then, and try to free yourself from vice. Let no labour repel you; for you have suffered something still more severe—let no effort be too great for you; for you have needed many efforts to resign yourself to your abject condition.

"Courage! my daughter, rise up and hope! let your heart be pure in the first place: form again a virginity in your soul and God will not desert you.

"The world will never forgive you, because, being more criminal than you, it has neither the right nor the generosity of forgiveness. But God will love you as a father loves his prodigal son, and your very faults, which repentance will make eternal sources of sorrow for you, will become for you expiatory sufferings and claims to the crown of martyrdom."

Having said these words, the Christ departed, for the poor woman sobbed and could no longer listen to him.

Jesus afterwards passed before other women who did not recognize him, and to whom he did not speak, because they were brutified by vice and contented in their abjectedness, from love of disorder and hatred of good. He looked upon them as diseased persons fallen into delirium and prayed silently for them.

He saw others whose life was a continued drunkenness, and who intoxicated themselves in order to forget; and he compared them to those unfortunates who have lost their reason; but he pitied them the more because their madness was voluntary.

But he cursed none of those women, because they were all unhappy. He pitied them, on the contrary, and loved them, because no one loves them.

But there were men who passed in the street and who insulted those unfortunates. Jesus approached them and said to them: "You doubtless are modest, since you insult these women who have lost their modesty. You doubtless know the sanctity of love, since you insult these women who sell their deplorable complaisance. You doubtless respect the sex of your mother, and of her who is or who will be the mother of your children, since you thus despise these poor women, who have lost all their maternal dignity."

"What is that to you?" replied those men rudely. "We do what pleases us; go your ways. Are you the defender of these creatures?

Jesus said to them: "If these creatures are despicable, what name shall be given to you, to you who degrade them? For it is of your brutality that they are made the servants; and if there were no men like you, there would be no women like them.

"Now, you know that, according to the law of nature, the husband is the head of the conjugal society, and that he answers before men even for the disorders of his wife.

"Now, I tell you that, before God, the legitimate wife of the debauchee is the prostitute, and that he ought to be branded before men with all the disorders of her whom he habitually makes his companion.

"Now, as each man who unites himself intimately with woman, makes but one with her, when you outrage these poor creatures, your insults fall back upon yourselves and you alone deserve them."

On hearing this discourse, these men were filled with confusion and bit their tongues with anger, but no one of them dared to insult or threaten Jesus, for he spoke boldly to them, and those who can insult women are naturally cowards.

They murmured among themselves and stammered insults and rude railleries in a low voice. But Jesus turned his back upon them and departed. And they did not suspect who it was that had just spoken to them.

From the Boston Courier.

## A RIVAL TO ETHER—CHLOROFORM.

We have been reading a pamphlet which was received by one of our distinguished physicians, by the last English steamer, giving an account of a new Anæsthetic agent as a substitute for Sulphuric Ether, &c. by J. Y. Simpson, of the Edinburgh University. The writer has used ether very extensively since the discovery of its power of stupefying patients, sufficiently to prevent their feeling pain while undergoing surgical operations, and in the meantime has been engaged in attempts to discover some other therapeutic agents. For this purpose he has had several patent drugs manufactured for experiment, by first-rate chemists. He has also tried the effects of several preparations upon himself. At last he has concluded that the article infinitely more efficacious than any of the others is Chloroform, or the Perchloride of Formyle; and he is enabled to speak confidently of its properties, having tried it upon upwards of thirty individuals.

It was first discovered by Souberain, in 1831, and next by Liebig in 1832; its composition was first accurately ascertained by Dumas, a French chemist, in 1835. It has been used by some practitioners internally, but no person has been known to use it by inhalation—nor has any one discovered its anæsthetic properties till the date of Dr. Simpson's experiments.

Chloroform is a dense, limpid, colourless liquid, readily evaporating, and possessing an agreeable and fragrant fruit-like odour, and a sweet, pleasant taste. For use as a substitute for ether, experiment has proved that it possesses many advantages over that article, as a much smaller quantity is required. Dr. Simpson has seen a strong person rendered completely insensible by six or seven inspirations of thirty drops. Its action is more rapid and complete, and the preliminary stage of excitement which pertains to all narcotising agents being curtailed, or indeed practically abolished, the patient has not the same degree of tendency to exhilaration and talking.

Persons who have experienced the sensations produced by ether inhalation and chloroform, much prefer the latter. Its perfume is not unpleasant, but the reverse, and the odour of it does not remain for any length of time attached to the clothes of the attendant, nor does the odour exhale in a disagreeable form from the lungs of the patient, as is generally the case with sulphuric ether.

Being required in less quantity, it is cheaper and much more portable and transmissible than sulphuric ether.

No kind of inhaler or instrument is necessary for administering the chloroform, as a little of it poured on a sponge, or on a handkerchief, and held to the mouth and nose of the patient, or even on a piece of linen or paper, generally suffices in about a minute or two to produce the desired effect.

Dr. Simpson has seen it used with perfect success in tooth-drawing, opening abscesses, and for relieving pain, and he has used it in obstetric practice.—He gives in his pamphlet a notice of its chemical constitution. He says—

"Formyle is the hypothetical radical of formic acid. In the red ant (*Formica rufa*) formic acid was first discovered, and hence its name. Gehlen pointed it out as a peculiar acid; and it was afterwards first artificially prepared by Doebereiner.—Chemists have now devised a variety of processes, by which formic acid may be obtained from starch, sugar, and indeed, most other vegetable substances.

"A series of chlorides of formyle are produced when chlorine and the hypochlorites are brought to act on the chloride, oxide, and hydrated oxide of methyle, (pyroxylic or wood spirit.) In the same way as formic acid may be artificially procured from substances which do not contain formyle ready formed—so also are the chlorides of this radical capable of being procured from substances which do not origally contain it.

"Chloroform, Chloroformyle, or the Perchloride of formyle, may be made and obtained artificially by various processes—as by making milk of lime, or an aqueous solution of caustic alkali act upon chloral—by distilling alcohol, pyroxylic spirit, or acetone, with chloride of lime—by leading a stream of chlorine gas into a solution of caustic potass in spirit of wine, &c. The preparation which I have employed, was made according to the following formula of Dumas:

| | |
|---|---|
| R Chloride of lime in power, - | lb. IV. |
| Water, - - - | lb. XII. |
| Rectified spirit, - - - | f z. XII. |

"Mix in a capacious retort or still, and distill as long as a dense liquid, which sinks in the water with which it comes over, is produced.

"The resulting perchloride of formyle consists of two atoms of carbon, one of hydrogen, and three of chlorine. Its specific gravity is much greater than that of water, being as high as 1.480. It boils at 141°. The density of its vapour is 4.2. It is not inflammable; nor changed by distillation with potassium, potash, sulphuric, or other acids.

Appended to the pamphlet, in the shape of a postscript, we find an account of several cases of operation in the Royal Infirmary of Edinburgh, which were performed while the patients were under the effects of the inhalation of chloroform. They were witnessed by a great collection of professional gentlemen and students. We copy them as matters of interest to our readers:—

"The two first cases were operated on by Professor Miller; the third by Dr. Duncan. In applying the chloroform in the first case, I used a pocket-handkerchief as the inhaling instrument; in the two last I employed a hollow sponge.

"Case 1.—A boy, four or five years old, with necrosis of one of the bones of the fore-arm. Could speak nothing but Gaelic. No means, consequently, of explaining to him what he was required to do. On holding a handkerchief, on which some Chloroform had been sprinkled, to his face, he became frightened, and wrestled to be away. He was held gently, however, by Dr. Simpson, and obliged to inhale. After a few inspirations he ceased to cry or move, and fell into a sound snoring sleep. A deep incision was now made down to the diseased bone; and, by the use of the forceps, nearly the whole of the radius, in the state of sequestrum, was extracted. During this operation, and the subsequent examination of the wound by the finger, not the slightest evidence of the suffering of pain was given. He still slept on soundly, and was carried back to his ward in that state. Half an hour afterwards, he was found in bed, like a child newly awakened from a refreshing sleep, with a clear, merry eye, and placid expression of countenance, wholly unlike what is found to obtain after ordinary etherization. On being questioned by a Gaelic interpreter who was found among the students, he stated that he had never felt any pain, and that he felt none now. On being shown his wounded arm, he looked much surprised, but neither cried nor otherwise expressed the slightest alarm.

"Case II—A soldier who had an opening in the cheek—the result of exfoliation of the jaw—was next made to inhale. At first he showed some signs of moving his hands too freely; but soon also fell into a state of sleep and snoring. A free incision was made across the lower jaw, and from this the dense adhering integuments were freely dissected all round, so as to raise the soft parts of the cheek.—The edges of the opening were then made raw, and the whole line of incision was brought together by several points of suture. This patient had previously undergone two minor operations of a somewhat similar kind; both of them had proved unsuccessful, and he bore them very ill—proving unusually unsteady, and complaining bitterly of severe pain.—On the present occasion he did not whince or moan in the slightest degree; and, on a return of consciousness, said, that he had felt nothing. His first act, when apparently about half awake, was suddenly to clutch up the sponge with which the chloroform was used, and readjust it to his mouth, obviously implying that he had found the inhalation from it anything but a disagreeable duty.

"This case was further interesting as being one of those operations in the region of the mouth, in which it has been deemed impossible to use ether—and certainly it would have been impossible to have performed the operation with any complicated inhaling apparatus applied to the mouth of the patient.

"Case III—A young man, of about twenty-two years of age, having necrosis of the first phalanx of the great toe, and ulceration of the integuments, the consequence of injury. The ulcerated surface was exceedingly tender to the touch—so much so, that he winced whenever the finger was brought near to it; and the slightest pressure made him cry out. After the removal of the dressings, which caused some pain and fretting, the inhalation was commenced, and the patient almost immediately * became insensible, and lay perfectly still, while the diseased mass was being removed by amputation of the toe through the middle of the second phalanx. The inhalation was now stopped. The edges of the wound were then brought together with three stitches, and the wound dressed. The patient shortly afterwards awoke, looked around him, and gratefully declared his entire and perfect freedom from all pain and uneasiness during the operation.

"The whole quantity of chloroform used in these three operations did not exceed half an ounce—and as Professor Miller afterwards observed to the students that were present, if ether had been used, several ounces of it would have been requisite to produce the same amount of anæsthetic effect."

The following case occurred also to Mr. Miller, in private practice:

"Case IV—A young lady wished to have a tumor (encysted) dissected out from beneath the angle of the jaw. The chloroform was used in small quantity (about a drachm), sprinkled upon a piece of operation sponge. In considerable less than a minute she was sound asleep, sitting easily in a chair, with her eyes shut, and with her ordinary expression of countenance. The tumor was extirpated, and a stitch inserted, without any pain either having been shown or felt. Her sensations, throughout, as she subsequently stated, had been of the most pleasing nature; and her manageableness during the operation was as perfect as if she had been a wax doll or a lay figure.

"No sickness, vomiting, headache, salivation, uneasiness of chest, in any of the cases. Once or twice a tickling cough took place in the first breathings."

* Dr. Christison, who was watching the result, informs me that this patient was affected in half a minute.

## RELIGIOUS FREEDOM.

What is religious freedom but the free, unshackled development of mind and truth? It is an old proverb that "truth requires only a free stage and no favour;" why, then, seek to smother her with endowments? Freedom would secure "a free stage and no favour" to every man and every truth. But that is incompatable with "endowments." Gamaliel spoke the language of freedom when he said of Christianity, "Leave it alone: if it be of God ye cannot overthrow it, but if it be of man it will perish of itself." Yes, freedom in religion is the most certain and most efficient test of public principle; and especially is this the case among an enlightened people. Truth needs no protection. It may be a plant of a *slow* growth, but, like the sturdy oak, it is all the more enduring for that. If we attempt to *force* it, we impair its vigour and strength. It is the steady, but stately oak of the forest, and not the tender plant of the hot-house, which is able to withstand storms and tempests, and give shelter to man and beast. So truth, to outlive the jars, shocks, and revolutions of States, and guide men at last to the haven of peace and happiness, must be the free, spontaneous growth of an unbiassed mind, and not the cradled offspring of doubt and suspicion. The moment you "endow" truth—the instant you put it under protection—you deprive it of a certain portion of its power, for you make it suspected. Surely that which is omnipotent needs not the puny arm of man to sustain it. Truth is, in fact, like the muscles of the body, weakened by swaddling and supporting, and strengthened most by free exercise.—*Universe.*

## THE DOWNFALL OF INDIA RUBBER.

Steam and caoutchouc were a long time looked upon as ultimates to the various uses to which they could be applied. The possibility of discovering a substitute for either was hardly dreamed of; but the possibilities of human experience can never be guessed at; it is just as certain that the next age will surpass the present in the aids of progress, as the present surpasses the past. In short progress is of necessity infinite; like a circle it can have no end. Steam has lost one half its consequence by the invention of the magnetic telegraph, and the universal caoutchouc will be almost entirely superceded by the discovery of a kindred element of happiness, the Gutta Percha.

As the gutta percha is but just coming into use, not one half of its appliances can now be surmised, but it has already been found superior to India-rubber in the majority of purposes for which that material has been used, while it is capable of being employed in many cases where India-rubber was inefficient. Gutta Percha is the gum of a tree which grows on the island of Borneo, and the entire Malayan Peninsula abounds in extensive forests of this most valuable production of the tropics. The tree is very large and bears some resemblance to the India-rubber tree, but differs from it in its botanical characteristics. The sap of the tree exudes from its lacerated surface, but quickly becomes hard on being exposed to the air.

It is purified by being boiled in hot water, when it becomes soft and plastic; below a temperature of fifty degrees it is nearly as hard as wood; it is extremely tough but becomes plastic when it is cut into thin strips; at a temperature below boiling water it becomes as soft and yielding as melted wax or putty, and may be moulded into any form or stretched out thinner than the finest paper. When it cools it becomes hard and tough again and retains its plastic shape without the slightest change by contraction or warping. Its tenacity is wonderful; a thin slip (about the weight of fifty pounds; the process of melting and cooling seems to have no effect in injuring its qualities. It burns freely and emits an odour when ignited similar to that of caoutchouc; it is easily dissolved in oil of turpentine, but with difficulty in ether and other solvents of India-rubber.

The uses of this valuable material are almost infinite; it combines all the valuable properties of the best tanned leather, with the elasticity of caoutchouc, and a durability which neither of them possesses, and for strapping machinery supplies a want that has long been seriously experienced. It will answer all the purposes to which leather is applied, and is immensely superior to that of India-rubber for boots and shoes. Indeed the old phrase of "nothing like leather" will be deprived of its significance by the gutta percha. A leaf of gutta percha, no thicker than bank note paper, is as impervious to water as glass: for umbrellas, overcoats, roofs of houses, bottoms of ships, covering of boxes, and in all cases where protection from wet is desired, its use will be invaluable. It can be formed into gas pipes and water pipes of any size, and degree of strength that may be required; and used for such purposes will decompose or wear out; and being ductile and elastic it may be applied in a thousand shapes and for thousands of purposes where iron or lead cannot be used.

Its utilitarian uses are endless; it will supply the place of tin, wood, copper, iron, stone, and even glass, for such purposes as buckets, tubs, vases, goblets, drinking cups, and all manner of utensils which are not used over the fire. But its uses for ornamental purposes are even more varied. In England it has already been used to a considerable extent in bookbinding, and for that purpose alone it must soon entirely supersede leather. For mouldings of all kinds, from the cornices of a house, the capitals of pillars in architecture, to the most delicate and intricate fancy work, such as snuff-boxes, picture frames, knife handles, and the ornamentation of rooms, carriages fountains, ship's cabins, steamboats, and the innumerable articles which are made to gratify the eye, it must supersede all other materials.

Air, acids, and the ordinary chemical agencies have no effect upon it. It is harder than horn, softer than wax, more tenacious than caoutchouc, more durable than iron; nothing can injure it but a hot fire, and even that does not destroy it; and no ordinary rub can deface it. For floor cloths it will supersede the use of all other materials, as it can be made of extreme thinness perfectly impervious to air or water, and of greater durability than any other flexible material known. In its hard state it can with difficulty be cut with a knife or a saw, but when it is soft it can be moulded into the most delicate forms by the hand of a child. Great is Gutta Percha!—*Evening Mirror.*

From the Literary World.

## EXTRACT FROM A LETTER OF KANT.

"But the following occurrence appears to me to have the greatest weight of proof, and to set the assertion respecting Swedenborg's extraordinary gift out of all possibility of doubt. In the year 1756, when Swedenborg, towards the end of September, on Saturday, at four o'clock, P. M. arrived at Gottenburg, from England, Mr. William Castle invited him to his house, together with a party of fifteen persons. About six o'clock, Swedenborg went out, and after a short interval, returned to the company, quite pale and alarmed. He said that a dangerous fire had just broke out in Stockholm, at the Sundermalm, (Gottenburg is about fifty miles from Stockholm,) and that it was spreading very fast. He was restless, and went out often. He said that the house of one of his friends, whom he named, was already in ashes, and that his own was in danger. At eight o'clock, after he had been out again, he joyfully exclaimed, 'Thank God! the fire is extinguished, the third door from my house. This news occasioned great commotion throughout the whole city, and particularly among the company in which he was. It was announced to the Governor the same evening. On the Sunday morning Swedenborg was sent for by the Governor, who questioned him concerning the disaster. Swedenborg described the fire precisely, how it had begun, and in what manner it had ceased, and how long it had continued. On the same day the news was spread through the city, and, as the Governor had thought it worthy of attention, the consternation was considerably increased; because many were in trouble on account of their friends and property, which might have been involved in the disaster. On the Monday evening a messenger arrived at Gottenburg, who was despatched during the time of the fire. In the letters brought by him, the fire was described precisely in the manner stated by Swedenborg. On Tuesday morning the royal courier arrived at the Governor's, with the melancholy intelligence of the fire, of the loss which it had occasioned, and of the houses it had damaged and ruined, not in the least differing from that which Swedenborg had given immediately it had ceased; for the fire was extinguished at eight o'clock.

"What can be brought forward against the authenticity of this occurrence? My friend, who wrote this to me, has not only examined the circumstances of this extraordinary case at Stockholm, but also, about two months ago, at Gottenburg, where he is acquainted with the most respectable houses, and where he could obtain the most authentic and complete information; as the greatest part of the inhabitants, who are still alive, were witnesses to the memorable occurrence—I am, with profound reverence, &c. &c.

## WOMEN versus LADIES.

I address you in behalf of the proprieties of language—hoping that you will take pity upon affectation, and pinch it. The women and the females are all gone—and the feminine termination are following them very fast. To supply their places we have *ladies* always *ladies*. There are no authoresses, only lady-authors; and there are lady-friends, lady-cousins, lady-teachers, &c. Do the women know that *lady* is derived from *laide?* It either is so—or will arrive at that. It will be one of the ugliest words in the language if it continue to be fearfully abused.

This affectation was at its height some fifteen or twenty years ago. It is a fact that to an action brought in which plaintiff set forth that he had hired the whole of defendant's coach, but that when it was about to start a woman was inside without his consent, defendant pleaded, amongst other things, that the person described as a *woman* was in fact a *lady*. At that time, and for years afterwards, shocking to relate, there were no *wives* in the country. Look at any old newspaper, and you will see, "On the —th instant in —— street, the *lady* of —— ——, Esq. of a daughter." It ought to have been *lady-son* not *daughter*; and any gentleman ought to have called any other gentleman out if that other gentleman dared to speak of his *lady-brother* by the style and title of his *sister*. But matters have mended a good deal, men own their wives now in the newspapers. An honest Otaheitean (or Tahitian as we call it now I believe) who came over here at the time I speak of, told his countrymen that the English whenever one of their children was born cut off the fourth finger of their wives' left hands as an offering to a goddess called Fashion—but that the finger grew again in a little while. This was the only rendering his language would yield—which is very creditable to the Tahitian tongue, and shows that it puts things in their true light.

I am myself, of the ancient school, which believes and maintains the true faith to be that all adult human creatures not being men are women; which declares openly that all women, be they ladies or not, are females—and all married females wives. The same old-fashioned community asserts that our language has no adjective which can be substituted for *female*—and that *womanly* and *feminine* are adjectives having men to whom they are applicable and women to whom they are not. It was one of the former—probably Fribble himself—who invented the term *lady-friend*, and it would have been a good thing for the language if the first woman who had heard it had been one of the latter and had kicked him for his pains. As to *authors*, (meaning authoresses) I once got a book from one marked "from the author," and I wondered to myself whether she meant to stand up for the old song—

Adam was the first man,
Eve was the t' other.

I wish the women would send the word *lady* back to its proper sphere. Something will be sure to happen if they do not. *Gentleman* was abused until it was shortened into *gent*;—and what a straight the gents are in just now!

*Woman* is a term of high honour;—it is a great pity that it may not be used in respect to any female whatever, were it from a beggar to a princess. Its corresponding Greek term, *gune*, is that by which slaves often address their mistresses in the Greek tragedy. With our notions, the address of Christ to his mother beginning with the word *woman*, appears disrespectful,—in the original it is merely the reverse. Let women not [illegible] with the term *lady* in our language, as used to supplant *woman*, arose the school of men which sneered at females of cultivated mind under the name of blue-stockings. Search antiquity through time and space, from age to age, and from country to country, and it will be found that respect for knowledge in females is always co-existent with their designation under homely names.—The word *lady*, generally used, ought to be odious as the product of a time in which women were taken to be necessarily frivilous. But when women were women, we have the account of an Apollonius who wrote a biography filled with no names but those of female philosophers. Nay, Suidas himself has preserved the name of a historian who wrote accounts of a large number of female *Pythagoreans*. Madam Dacier ought to have reminded her husband to mention this, (which I cannot find that he has done,) in his Life of Pythagoras,—for it shows that, in spite of all saws to the contrary, a whole bookful of women endured the silent system to which the followers of that sect were subjected. Nor are the accounts of these works at all unlikely, for Menage has collected the names of sixty-four women who had distinguished themselves in the schools of philosophy—with as much information about them as gives to one with another, more than an octavo page a-piece. Plutarch dedicated more than one work to woman. Three empresses, (and an empress was then only a woman,) have distinguished the name of Eudocia by their literary acquirements. The last has left us, (and in the dark eleventh century,) the historical dictionary which is frequently quoted in support of, or opposition to, Suidas. A great deal more might be said to the same effect—but it would take up too much room. I hope all good women will leave *lady* to appear where it is properly wanted—and not continue to degrade their sex by speaking of it as a whole under a term which merely signifies a conventional distinction. If they will not, we must have a new translation of Genesis—and in it must appear, "gentleman and lady created He them."—*Athenaeum.*

From the London Punch.

## A PARDON—FOR NOTHING.

In October last, a young woman named Mary Ann Turford, was tried in the Central Criminal Court for stealing a watch. She was found guilty, and sentenced to six months' imprisonment at Brixton.—The theft, it appears, was committed by another person. One James William Ward has been convicted for the same offence; of which, moreover, he has confessed himself the perpetrator. The innocence of the girl thus having been clearly established, a representation of her case was made by Mr. Norton to the Under-Secretary. Sir Denis Le Marchant, we are told, writes back, and says that Sir George Grey, taking into consideration the facts as set forth in Mr. Norton's communication, has recommended her Majesty's free pardon in the case of Mary Ann Turford.

Now, as a pardon means the forgiveness of an offender, and Mary Ann Turford committed no offence, the propriety of the term, as applied to the remission of her sentence, may be questioned. But this is a shallow cavil. A philosopher has said, that men have the greatest difficulty to forgive those whom they have injured. It is with the law as with mankind in general; the law, therefore, has stretched a point in having forgiven Mary Ann Turford. To consider that the order for her liberation should have been accompanied by an expression of regret—not to say by any compensation for her month's false imprisonment——is to be extremely ignorant of human nature—at least of Home-Office humanity. Of course, Mary Ann Turford may think herself very well off. She has received a pardon—for nothing.

A *Good Man* was lately attempting the conversion of a fellow in prison, who had shown signs which were considered hopeful. After a suitable opening, the instructer, wishing to make his teachings appropriate, said, "What brought you here, my friend?" "Two sheriffs," said the catechumen. "Ahem, yes; but I mean, had intemperance anything to do with your misfortune?" "Yes," sad the convict, meekly, "they were both drunk."

# Gleanings from Foreign Publications.

Dates of Shakspeare's Plays.—Mr. Collier, in a paper "On the earliest quarto editions of Shakspeare," published in the third volume of the Shakspeare Society's papers, says: "It has generally been said that there are twenty quarto editions of plays by Shakspeare printed anterior to the folio of 1623; but the fact is, that, exclusive of 'The Taming of Shrew,' the title page of the quarto edition of which bears date in 1631, there are only seventeen quartos. Steevens, in 1766, to make up the number, added the two parts of 'The Troublesome Reign of King John,' 1611, which nobody in modern times has imputed to Shakspeare, although 'Written by W. Sh.' was inserted fraudulently on the title page by the old printer. He also reprinted, among his twenty quartos, the two parts of the 'Contention between the two Houses of Lancaster and York,' but he strangely omitted 'Pericles,' which had much more than an equal claim to the distinction. The undoubted plays of Shakspeare, which came from the press in quarto before 1622, were the following, and our list is made out according to the dates of publication: Romeo and Juliet, 1597; Richard the Second, 1597; Richard the Third, 1597; Henry the Fourth, (part 1,) 1598; Love's Labours Lost, 1598; Midsummer Night's Dream, 1600; Much Ado About Nothing, 1600; Merchant of Venice, 1600; Henry the Fourth, (part 2,) 1600; Henry the Fifth, 1600; Titus Andronicus, 1600; Merry Wives of Windsor, 1602; Hamlet, 1603; King Lear, 1608; Troilus and Cressida, 1609; Pericles, 1609; Othello, 1622. Thus it will be seen at once how irregularly Shakspeare's dramas came from the press, viz: three in 1597, two in 1598, six in 1600, one in 1602, and another in 1603, one in 1608, two in 1609, and one in 1622.—Why six separate productions were crowded into 1600, while in various years none at all appeared, is a matter of curious and interesting speculation; five of these six were printed from good manuscripts, whether derived from the theatre or from any other source, while the sixth was indisputably surreptitious, and never could have been authorized by anybody." The Athenæum remarks upon this, that "We are not to suppose, though Shakspeare never blotted a line, that the six plays were all written in one year; but the fact that six of his plays were printed in one year is a circumstance in Shakspeare's life which his biographers have hitherto neglected to relate—or at least to remark upon in the way which a fact of the kind, as we take it, would seem to deserve."

A poetical oyster-shop-keeper advertises his wares in the Port Philip Patriot; his name is Peter Perkins; his oysters are "as large as butter firkins."—He invites the "man of British blood," to his shop:

"And let him have a friend with him to sup,
It takes two men to eat one oyster up."

The Toryism of Astronomy.—In Huddersfield, during the last and a part of the present week a "gentleman," who assumes the euphonious name of "Tryon," has been reaping a rich harvest from lecturing on astronomy, at 2d. per head. Among other extraordinary things, (not having the fear of Sir Isaac Newton before his eyes,) he asserts that this earth is not a planet or a globe, and that it does not revolve either on axis, or in orbit, but that it is an extended plain, remaining at rest, and quotes Moses and Joshua in support of his theory! that the sun is only fifty miles distant, and that neither it nor the moon and stars are bodies, but lights only—like Shelley's rustic Newton,

"Those mighty spheres that gem infinity
Were only specs of tinsel; fixed in heaven
To light the midnights of his native town."

And yet he manages to invest these absurdities with a great deal of pomp, piety, and awe, and it is amusing to observe the effect he produces upon his stultified audience.—*Sheffield Iris.*

At the Isle of Wight Petty Sessions, Mr. Wm. Woodlands was convicted of an assault; he declared in defence that the plaintiff would swear through a mile of Bibles.

Dust in the Eye.—We see such exquisite adaptation, in lachrymal appendages, that the exercise of their functions are carried on without exciting the least sensation. If a particle of dust be blown upon the eye, which particle is of form and size to give the sensation of its presence under the lid, and the eyelids be not rubbed, then, although it may give pain, this soon goes off, and the patient is no longer aware of its presence. The particle has lodged under the tarsal edge, and becoming quickly enveloped with the secretion of the glands there, is no longer an irritant, nor does it excite any feeling. It is, indeed, in the condition of the natural secretions of the part, and therefore it may be present without impressing the sensation. But nevertheless it is a stimulus, although insensibly so to the part, to excite that process which quietly removes the particle from under the lid, and completely ejects it. "But in the same case if the eye be rubbed, then the particle, instead of remaining at the edge of the lid and getting a coat of mucus quickly, so as to be quickly removed, is, by the act of rubbing, which excites the obicularis to retain it, carried further under the lid; where it not only excites a painful sensation, but keeps up the irritation it produces a considerable time; indeed, until it is clothed with mucus, which is now a longer process to go through than in the other case.—*Vincent's Observations on Surgical Practice.*

The London correspondent of the Atlas says of Dickens:

It is reported that his financial affairs trouble him, and that his best policy is to travel on the continent. I am informed that even the manuscript of "Dombey & Son" is not written and delivered with very great promptness. Is it not a curse to have one's own thoughts mortgaged?—To have them bargained and paid for long before they are born?—This is too apt to be the case with London writers.

Borrowing Books.—When Farquhar was at Trinity College, Dublin, he sent to a gentleman to borrow Burnett's "History of the Reformation;" but the gentleman sent him word he never lent any book out of his chamber: but that if he would come there, he should make use of it as long as he pleased. A short time after, the owner of the book sent to borrow Mr. Farquhar's bellows, who returned for answer, "I never lend my bellows out of my own chamber; but if he would please to come there he should make use of them as long as he would."—*Chetwood's General History of the Stage.*

Chloroform and Ether.—The advantages which chloroform possesses over ether are—1. The smaller quantity required; thus rendering it more portable. Half a drachm or a drachm of chloroform will almost always succeed in producing perfect narcotism.—2. The absence of the stage of excitement or stimulation, which almost invariably attends ether, and sometimes to an inconvenient extent. 3. The greater rapidity and certainty with which the patient is brought under its influence. 4. The more complete and longer-continued state of perfect insensibility produced. 5 Chloroform does not leave any disagreeable odour about the breath or clothes of either patient or operator; in fact, chloroform has a very pleasant, fruit-like, though transient smell. 6. No headache or other unpleasant effects are left behind. Dr. Protheroe Smith in the *Lancet*. [The medical journals contain several accounts of the successful use of chloroform.]—*Jerrold's Newspaper.*

House of Commons, Tuesday, Nov. 23.

The Speaker took the chair at 12 o'clock, but as early as 11, a remarkable and ancient ceremony was performed, that of going through all the vaults and other apartments underneath both Houses of Parliament, in order to guard against the possibility of any attempt similar to that undertaken by Guy Fawkes. This search is made on the first day of every session, with as much care and as much minute precaution as if danger were really apprehended; every passage and every nook being, with the aid of lamps and flambeaux, as fully examined as if there existed any rational ground for suspicion. Engaged in this duty were twelve yeomen of the guard, two exons, two marshalmen, Mr. Phipps' (an officer from the Department of the Woods and Forests,) Mr. Finchman (Clerk of the Works,) Sir Augustus Clifford, Mr. Pullman, the Lord Great Chamberlain, &c. &c.

The Esquimaux.—We (*Hall Packet*) have had the pleasure of paying a visit to the two Esquimaux, announced as having arrived in this port in the *Truelove*, from Cumberland Straits. It appears that they are natives of the Island of Nightalick, in the Cumberland Straits, and have come over to this country on their own accord, for the purpose of procuring fire-arms and instruments for killing fish and game, which is their only subsistence. During three or four months in the year, the whole tribe are in a most wretched state of existence, from the want of the means of procuring food. The two who have come over were betrothed when the woman was four years of age, and were only married the day previous to leaving their native country. The man is rather more than seventeen years of age, and the woman about two years younger. They are of a very dark copper colour, and of a rather diminutive size. During the voyage to this country they have taken nothing but raw beef and cold water, and on cooked meat being offered to them, they turned away from it with disgust. Captain Parker, the master of the *Truelove*, is now engaged in teaching them the English language, and they can already make themselves understood. They will remain in this country until March.

The last new method of producing artificial light is by way of electricity. The chief peculiarity of the patent taken out by Mr. Wright, of Cooper's-hill, Thames Ditton, consists in the production of a permanent light by continually presenting one or more points of surfaces of carbon, or other suitable material, to the path of an electric current.

Chemical Analysis of Tea.—In the memoir of the London Chemical Society, there is an interesting paper by Mr. Warrington, on the analysis of tea, in which he states that he has not only removed the whole of the colouring matter, or glazing, from green tea, but he has been able to analyze the matter removed, and prove it by chemical evidence, to consist of Prussian blue and gypsum principally. So that in fact the drinkers of green tea, as it comes to the English market, indulge in a beverage of Chinese paint, and might imitate the mixture by dissolving Prussian blue and plaster of Paris in hot water.—The Chinese do not drink this painted tea; they only sell it.—*Gardener's Chronicle.*

A correspondent of the Oxford Chronicle points out somewhat of a discrepancy in the payment of Christian ministers—the curate of his parish for forty years